



Photo Swaine, New Bond Street, London

PAUL PHILIP LEVERTOFF.

JUDAISM ~~AND~~ CHRISTIANITY

Judaism and Christianity

Essays presented to the
REV. PAUL P. LEVERTOFF, D.D.

Edited by
FR. LEV GILLET
of the Russian Church, Paris

J. B. SHEARS & SONS
64, SYDNEY STREET, CHELSEA
LONDON, S.W.

Printed in Great Britain

Contents

PREFACE

1. THE REV. PREBENDARY W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D.,
Professor Emeritus, King's College, London:
The Jewish Liturgy.
2. THE REV. A. W. GREENUP, D.D., Litt.D.: The Day
of Atonement.
3. THE REV. C. T. HARLEY WALKER, M.A., B.Lit.:
Karma and Goel.
4. THE EDITOR: Questions concernant la Chekinah.
5. THE LATE BISHOP WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D.,
Community of the Resurrection: What Advantage
hath the Jew?
6. THE LATE CANON H. L. GOUDGE, D.D., *Regius*
Professor of Divinity, Christ Church, Oxford: The
Calling of the Jews.
7. DR. LEVERTOFF'S Liturgy in Latin.
8. LIC. PAUL SCHORLEMER: Eine judenchristliche
Liturgie.
9. THE REV. W. A. WALKER, M.A., B.D.: The Problem
of a Jewish-Christian branch of the Catholic
Church.
10. OLGA TATJANA LEVERTOFF: Paul Levertoff and the
Jewish-Christian Problem.

Bibliography.

Preface

On the occasion of Dr. Paul Levertoff's sixtieth anniversary, some of his friends have gathered the following essays as a token of their admiration for him and for the cause to which he has dedicated his life.

Two of the contributors to the present book are dead. Canon Goudge died shortly after the essay reproduced here had appeared in the periodical *The Church and the Jews*; Bishop Frere's essay, also published in *The Church and the Jews*, had not been written in view of this volume, but, remembering his lasting friendship with Dr. Levertoff, we thought it meet to include here these lines, which date from the latter part of his life. To the memory of these two great Anglican Divines, Walter Frere and H. L. Goudge, we pay a respectful tribute.

Enough is said in the following pages about Dr. Levertoff and the Jewish-Christian problems to make it unnecessary for the editor to broach these matters or to introduce them to the reader. But there is one thing which might be pointed out. Dr. Levertoff's friends are sometimes disappointed by the delay in the publishing of the important works he has been preparing for so long. The essential task of his life seems always to be more or less held back by the incidental tasks or burdens. The work for the Jewish refugees has lately been making on him ever-growing demands. The Students' Hostel in Shoreditch is absorbing a valuable part of his time. Shall we regret it? The intellectual side of the Jewish Christian work may have somewhat suffered. But, if ailing human bodies have been sheltered and fed, if grieving human souls have been soothed and helped, must we not rejoice? Moreover, Dr. Levertoff's recent and rather bold *excursus* out of the field of scholarship has taught some

sceptical people a useful lesson. It has shown that there are cases where so-called practical men prove utterly inefficient or muddling, while the hopeless dreams of the idealist come true.

The editorship of this *symposium* has been entrusted to a priest-monk of the Orthodox Church, lecturer at the Russian Theological Institute in Paris. This is explained through the fact that the editor closely collaborates with Dr. Levertoff's work in Holy Trinity Students' Hostel. When so much is spoken about "œcumenism," such a collaboration between two priests of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches may be looked upon as a small anticipation of what could be done on a greater scale and also as an indication of the possibilities inherent in Jewish Christianity to open new paths towards Christian Union. Every day I witness the modest and strenuous efforts of Dr. Levertoff on behalf of "his" students, and I find a continuous joy in living with these gifted young men. For this I express to him and to them my deep gratitude.

May the Shepherd of Israel extend to Paul Levertoff for many years more the blessings promised by the Gospel to the meek, the pure in heart, the merciful, and to the wise rabbi who draws out of the treasury of divine knowledge things old and new.

LEV GILLET,
Priest of the Orthodox Russian Church.

Holy Trinity Students' Hostel, Shoreditch.

August, 1939.

THE JEWISH LITURGY: AN APPRECIATION

The Jewish Liturgy, like the Christian, has a long history behind it, and has undergone changes of various kinds. Both, moreover, have assumed different forms, to some extent, during the course of their history in different countries. But in both there are certain fundamental elements which, in their essence, have never undergone change. It is to some of these, in the Jewish Liturgy, to which I desire to draw attention.

The first may be expressed thus: the extraordinary intimacy assumed to exist between God and His worshippers as expressed by the wording of the prayers. It is difficult for anyone to realize the whole force of what this means, and the impression created, unless one has compared the Jewish Liturgy with other ancient Eastern and Western liturgies. This beautiful *trait* in the Jewish Liturgy is well worth a little pondering over. However we may define the word "religion," it will be granted that, in its essence, it centres in the relationship between man and his God. That relationship may be, and is, expressed in varied form in different religious systems, and the form of expression will depend on a variety of things, stage of culture, capacity for apprehension and consequent conception of God, national temperament, language and its mode of articulation, and so on; but the way in which that relationship *is* expressed stamps the religious genius of a people. It is, therefore, in the wording of the prayers of the Jewish Liturgy that the religious genius of those who composed them is set forth. And these prayers proclaim a realization of the power and love of God, and of trustfulness and dependence on

Him on the part of man, which is extremely impressive, and thus help one to understand how it is that Judaism has played the part it has in the dissemination of the knowledge of God in the history of the world. The wording of these prayers tell of an *experience of God*, of an inner witness and nobody who utters them in sincerity can do so without the conviction that God is very near to him. Among many illustrations may be mentioned the ancient prayer *Wehu Rachum*, "And he, being merciful," which reveals so strikingly the realization of the unworthiness of the penitent in the sight of an all-loving God; inspired by the psalmist occur the words: "Mayest thou not deal with us according to our sins, nor requite us according to our iniquities. If our iniquities testify against us, do thou work, O Lord, for thy name's sake. Remember, O Lord, thy tender mercies and thy loving kindnesses; for they have been ever of old . . . Our Father, our King, be gracious unto us, and answer us, for we have no good works of our own; deal with us in charity (lit. in righteousness) for thy name's sake." There is nothing in the Jewish Liturgy more affecting than this frank acknowledgment of unworthiness in the sight of God, and the childlike trustfulness in His mercy, it is an element which occurs over and over again.

Another feature of a number of prayers in the Jewish Liturgy may next be noted; it arises out of what has just been said, and leads on to the consideration of one or two other matters which are not without interest. The realization of the intimate relationship between God and man to which reference has been made, could not be more fully expressed than in the prayers. But there are two things which must strike anyone who approaches the study of the Jewish Liturgy in a purely detached frame of mind. The language of some of the prayers will appear as somewhat unrestrained at times; too emotional; possibly in some instances a little wanting in dignity; here and there almost bordering on familiarity. Then there is, in certain prayers, the piling-up of epithets,

which unnecessarily increases the length of a prayer, and suggests the danger of unreality in offering it. That this last point is not unjustified is evident; for that great authority on the Jewish Liturgy, Elbogen, tells us that *Wehu Rachum*, for example, is popularly spoken of as "the long *Wehu Rachum*" ("der Volksmund spricht vom 'langen *Wehu Rachum*' ")¹; indeed, as is well known, this prayer occurs in a shortened form in some modern Rituals. This raises the practical question of the length of prayers; nobody will deny the tendency to wandering thoughts during a long drawn-out prayer, and therefore the danger to reality in worship. And the presence of this danger must be recognised in considering some of the long prayers in the Jewish Liturgy. On the other hand, we learn from the history of that Liturgy that many of the longer prayers were in earlier days considerably shorter; they have been added in the course of centuries. Then, also, there are prayers in this Liturgy which are quite short; for example, *'Ahabah Rabah*, in its original form, consisted only of about fifty words and even in its present form cannot be called long. Even shorter is the beautiful prayer called *'Ab harachamim*, and others, showing that the composers of such prayers fully sympathised with the difficulty felt by most people of prolonged mental concentration.

The language of the Jewish Liturgy raises another matter of practical interest. This language had always been Hebrew in the Temple worship even after Aramaic had become the vernacular, and the people were unable to understand what was said. We must assume, though there is no proof of this, that the prayers which we know to have been said during the offering of sacrifices, were in Hebrew. In Palestine, after the destruction of the Temple, worship in the synagogue, apart from the explanation of Scripture which was delivered in Aramaic, was conducted in Hebrew. But not so the synagogues of

¹ *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, p. 78 (1913).

the Dispersion, Babylonian Jewry probably excepted; Greek was the world-language, and there is every reason to believe that in the synagogues of the Dispersion the Service was said in Greek²; one has but to remember that the Hebrew Bible was translated into Greek because the Jews of the Dispersion did not know Hebrew; nor Aramaic for that matter. In spite of this, however, the Jewish Liturgy was handed down in Hebrew; and Hebrew is the language used in the synagogues of orthodox Jews at the present day. This, therefore, raises the question as to the justification or otherwise of offering worship in a language which the bulk of the people do not understand. That a translation is given does not touch the main point. The same question arises in reference to the *Christian* Liturgy. As everyone knows, in the largest of the Christian communities, the Roman, the Mass is said in Latin, which not one in a hundred in a congregation understands. In the Jewish Church it is recognised that the people *ought* to be able to understand the Service, as is proved by the accompanying translation; in the Roman Church it is frankly contended that there is no need for the congregation to understand it. Is there any justification, it may be asked, for this saying of a Service in a language "not understood of the people?" While I cannot feel personally that there is any justification for it, there are one or two points in connexion with the matter which deserve consideration. First, it must be allowed that reverence for the hallowed usage of many centuries makes a stirring appeal; there is something very moving in the thought of following in the wake of hundreds of generations of our forefathers; the sense of unity in worship with those who have gone before is very beautiful. These things must be allowed due weight. True, St. Paul would have us pray with the understanding as well as with the spirit, being the better way; but he does allow that the spirit prayeth, even

² Cp., e.g., Philo, *Vita Mosis*; and see Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. 22.

though the understanding be unfruitful. And then there is something else which may be urged. It must be recognised that some languages are more adapted for the expression of religious thoughts and emotions than others. Why it should be so I have no idea; but I feel convinced that it is so. In reading the prayers of the Jewish Liturgy in Hebrew I get quite a different impression from that conveyed when reading them in English. There was a *naïve* idea (which may raise a smile) held long ago, to the effect that the angels can understand and speak only in Hebrew; it was, therefore, essential that prayers should be offered up in Hebrew, otherwise the angels will not be able to carry the petitions of men before the Almighty, and add their own intercessions (cp Tobit xii. 15, where it is said that the seven holy angels "present the prayers of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One"). No wonder, therefore, that it is commanded that prayers should be offered up only in Hebrew (T.B. *Shabbath* 12b). Whatever reasons may have prompted such ideas, it cannot be denied that there is something about the Hebrew language which expresses religious thought in a special way. The present writer must, further, confess that the prayers of the English Book of Common Prayer are often more impressive when read in a Latin form. It may be claimed then, that there is something to be said for the liturgical use of these languages; but for the reason given it is not to be advocated; however appealing to the few, consideration for the great majority must come first.

These are just one or two thoughts and impressions gained by the study of the Jewish Liturgy; they could be greatly multiplied; but these must suffice for the present occasion; and I only hope that they may strike a sympathetic note in the heart of him who has an infinitely greater knowledge of the subject than I can have, and for whose grand work for God and our Lord Jesus Christ among the Chosen People I testify my profound admiration.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN PHILO, JOSEPHUS, THE NEW TESTAMENT AND POST-MISHNAIC TIMES

(a) IN PHILO AND JOSEPHUS.

The Hellenistic Jew Philo (c. 20 B.C.-50 A.D.) in his treatise περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἰδει νόμων εἰς τὰ συντείνοντα κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λόγων commonly cited as *De Specialibus Legibus*, attempts to explain the special Mosaic laws after the commandments of the Decalogue, and in connection with the fourth deals with those laws concerning the festivals. In speaking of the Day of Atonement he tells us that it is celebrated after the feast of trumpets (Lev. xxiii. 24), and that Moses called it the greatest of the festivals, naming it in Hebrew "the sabbath of sabbaths" (σάββατον σαββάτων) and that for many reasons:— (1) "the temperance which he ever commands to be observed, but especially on this day which God has chosen as a special day for its observance; (2) on this day everyone gives himself up to prayers, and devotes his leisure to nothing else from morning to evening; (3) because of the time at which the fast is fixed, for by this season the fruits of the whole year are gathered in, and to seek to devour these at once would be a mark of greediness, but to fast is a mark of perfect piety, teaching the intellect not to place its trust in the food prepared as the cause of health or life but in God who can nourish and preserve us as He did our fathers for forty years in the wilderness (Deut. viii. 2)" Philo asks why the day is fixed in the tenth month and answers:

Because ten is the perfect number,¹ and so "God ordained that abstinence from food should be in accordance with the perfect number, for the sake of affording the best nourishment to the best thing which is in us, that no one may suppose that the interpreter of God's word is enjoining hunger, the most unbearable of all evils, but only a brief cutting off of the stream which flows into the channels of the body."² In the *Vita Mosis* IIa he speaks of the respect and honour in which the fast is held, and of its being unlawful on it to partake of any food or drink "in order that no bodily passion may at all disturb or hinder the pure operations of the soul, whose passions are wont to be generated by fulness and satiety; so on this day the fast is kept with hopeful prayers, by which they are accustomed to ask forgiveness (ἀμνηστείαν) of old sins and the acquisition and enjoyment of new blessings." In the *Legatio ad Gaium*, §39, the inviolability of the Holy of Holies is stressed: "on the day called 'the fast' (τῇ νηστείᾳ λεγομένῃ) the High Priest enters the Holy of Holies to offer incense, and on no other day, in accordance with the national law, to pray for blessings and peace for all men, and if anyone else, I say not of Jews, but even the priests of higher or lower rank, should go therein either with or after him (Lev. xvi. 17), or if the High Priest himself should enter in on two days in the year, or on three or four times on the same day,³ he would inevitably suffer death."

Josephus (c. 37-95 A.D.) in his *Antiquities of the Jews* III, x. 3, gives the following brief account of the ceremonies of the day:—"They fast till evening, and on this day sacrifice a bull, two rams, seven lambs and a kid of the goats for sins. In addition they bring two kids of the goats, of which one is sent alive to the confines of the wilderness to be a sacrifice and expiation for the sins of all the peoples, and the other is led within the limits of

¹ cf. *De Plantatione Use*, §23.

² *De Sept.* II, §23.

³ See below and footnote 4.

the camp to a very clean place, where they burn it with its hide, not in any way cleansing it. And they burn with it a bull, not brought by the people but provided by the High Priest at his own expense (ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων). When this was slain he brought of the blood, together with that of the kid, into the sanctuary, and sprinkled the ceiling with his finger seven times and also the pavement, and as often towards the sanctuary and around the golden altar, and finally about the great altar, after he has brought it into the open court. In addition to this they lay on the altar the extremities, the kidneys and the fat, together with the lobes of the liver. The High Priest also offers a ram as a burnt offering to God." In the same book XVII. vi. 4, we read that the High Priest Matthias b. Theophilus, having become ritually unclean,⁴ was unable to officiate on the Day of Atonement, and so his duties were performed by his kinsman Joseph b. Ellemus.⁵ In the *Wars of the Jews*, V. 7, 5, Josephus speaks of the garments of the High Priest when he officiated at the ordinary services,⁶ and tells us that on the Day of Atonement, however, he discarded these for a more plain habit (λιτοσίραν ἐσθῆτα) before entering the Holy of Holies, which he did but once a year "on that day when it is our custom to keep a fast."⁷

(b) IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The absence of any reference to the Day of Atonement in the Gospels is to be explained⁸ from the fact that the day was given over entirely to the ritual of the Temple, when there would be no opportunity for Jesus to deliver discourses in Jerusalem as there was on the occasion of the national pilgrim festivals (cf. John vii. 37).

In Acts xxvii. 9 we read of St. Paul's voyage to Italy that it "was dangerous because the Fast (τὴν νηστείαν)

⁴ cf. Yoma I. 1.

⁵ The story is alluded to in Yoma 12b, Tosef, Yoma I. 4. cf. Aboth V. 5.

⁶ See Yoma VII. 5.

⁷ On *Antiquities* XIV. iv. 3. See S. Krauss in *Jew Encycl.* X. 123b.

⁸ Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, II. p. 22. (See, however, Levertoff on Mt. xii. 22-45, in the *New Comm.*, p. 158.—Ed.).

was now already gone by."⁹ Probably the time indicated by St. Luke here implies that at Fair Havens St. Paul kept the Day of Atonement in accordance with his normal custom of obedience to the Law (Acts xx. 16; xxi. 26; 1 Cor. ix. 20).

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews likens the entrance of Jesus into heaven to that of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement, and draws the contrast between the entrance of the High Priest once in the year (ἀπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, i.e. on one day only)¹⁰ with the blood offered for himself and the offences of the people, and Jesus who entered into the heavenly archetype once for all (εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια) with his own blood that his people might have free access to God (Heb. ix. 6 ff; x. 19 ff). A further reference to the "ritual of the day" is contained in Heb. xiii. 11, 12, where the death of Jesus without the gate (ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἔπαθεν) is likened to the burning of the sin-offering without the camp (cf. Exod. xxix. 14; Yoma vi. 7).¹¹

St. John, undoubtedly, has in mind the intercession of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement when he writes: "We have an advocate (παράκλητος; cf. Philo, *Vita Moysis* III, §14) with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John ii. 1, 2):¹² and it may be that the death of Christ is compared to the sacrifices of the Day in Rom. iii. 25, and in 1 Peter ii. 24.¹³

(c) IN POST-MISHNAIC TIMES.

After the destruction of the Temple prayer took the place of the sacrifices;¹⁴ but a curious custom arose to

⁹ See Lewin, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, II. p. 192n.

¹⁰ See Delitzsch, *Com. on Hebrews* (E. Tr. II. p. 64; Greenup, *Ascension of Christ*, pp. 5, 6).

¹¹ See further, Davidson, *Com. on Hebrews*, pp. 196-203.

¹² Findlay, *Fellowship in the Life Eternal*, p. 124; Brooke, *Com. on Epp. John*, p. 28.

¹³ Sunday and Headlam, *Com. on Romans*, p. 92; Caffin, *Com. on 1 Peter*, p. 76.

¹⁴ cf. Ber. 6b; Pesikta 165b. Moore (*Judaism*, II. p. 13) says: "The cessation of the sacrificial cultus, which in any other ancient religion

sacrifice on the eve of the Day of Atonement, a cock for a male (in preference a white one, in allusion to Isa. i. 18) and a hen for a female.¹⁵ The head of the household took the bird and recited Ps. cvii. 14-21 and Job xxx. 23, 24; then with his right hand on its head he swings it round his head, repeating three times "This is my atonement, this is my ransom, this is my atonement: this cock (or hen) goes to death, but may I be gathered and enter into a long and happy life and into peace!" The bird is then slain, and it or its money equivalent given to the poor. The custom is mentioned by the Geonim¹⁶ but is disapproved of, as being a pagan one, by Nachmanides, Joseph Caro and others.¹⁷

The practice of visiting the burial grounds on the eve of the day to make intercession for dead relatives held in some places (cf. Taanith 16a). It was customary to make confession before the last meal (known as "the meal of cessation") before the day, and to submit oneself to the beating of thirty-nine stripes (cf. Deut. xxv. 3; 2 Cor. xi. 24) at the hands of a neighbour as a penalty for sin, and also to ask forgiveness of each other.

Since white is the symbol of cleanliness (cf. Taanith IV. 8) white garments were worn on the day, though in late times the custom was associated with the shrouds of the dead.¹⁸

The practice of going barefooted to the synagogue on the day was customary in the Middle Ages, or in list slippers only (cf. Tos. Yoma V. 1). No golden ornaments were to be worn, since gold was the material of which the calf was made. (Exod xxxii. 4.)

would have been in a short while the end of it, was in Judaism not even a serious crisis, so completely had the worship of the Synagogue come to satisfy its religious needs.

¹⁵ In the case of a pregnant woman two hens and a cock; one hen for herself, a hen and a cock for the unborn in case of a girl or a boy being born.

¹⁶ The heads of the Babylonian academies in Sura and Pumbeditha.

¹⁷ See further *Shulchan Aruch*, §605; *Hebrew College Annual*, 1932, p. 686.

¹⁸ Abrahams, *Jew. Life in the Middle Ages* (ed. Roth), p. 314n.

The liturgical services of the Day of Atonement amongst the Ashkenazic and also amongst the Sephardic Jews are described in books easily accessible,¹⁹ and it need only be said here that though there are considerable differences in the various rites yet common to all are the description of the Temple services of the day (the Abodah), confession of sin, prayer for repentance and the restoration of the Temple. The blowing of the Trumpet at the end of the day after the Neilah service (see Singer's Prayer Book, p. 269) is, according to the Machsor Vitry, a memorial of the Jubilee which began on the tenth of Tisri (Lev. xxv. 9). Abrahams suggests that the custom is a survival of the blowing which marked the end of the Sabbath in Temple times.²⁰

The Day of Atonement is closely connected with Rosh ha-Shanah, the New Year; and the Kabbalist R. Moses Cordovero (1522-70 A.D.) instituted a fast known as "the Little Day of Atonement" to take place on the eve of the Jewish New Year, that the participant might be cleansed from all defilement on entering the New Year and so become "a new creature." In some prayer-books a special service is provided for this fast, penitential prayers playing an important part in it.²¹

The Samaritans²² keep a strict fast on the Day of Atonement, and, unlike the Jews (cf. Yoma viii, 4, 5), exempt neither children, except nursing infants, nor the sick. Conversation is forbidden all the day. Their liturgy consists mainly of confession of sins, and the reading of the Law, which is an essential part of the Samaritan Cultus. In the early morning there is a procession to visit the tombs of the prophets, where prayers are offered; and towards the end of the afternoon service

¹⁹ e.g. Dembitz, *Jew. Services in Syn. and Home* (1898); Idelsohn, *Jew. Liturgy* (1932).

²⁰ Note in Singer, op. cit. p. cciii.

²¹ Baer, *Abodath Israel*, pp. 319 ff.; Eisenstein, *Ozar Dinim*, &c. 166 ff.

²² Thomson, *The Samaritans*, pp. 134 ff.; Cowley, *Samaritan Liturgy*, pp. 488-715.

the two oldest scrolls of the Law are exhibited to the people, who stroke and kiss them; after this prayers are continued till sunset. The last part of the service resembles somewhat the "Rejoicing of the Law" which was added to the Jewish observance of the feast of Tabernacles.²³

The Karaite customary observance of the day may be gathered from the official statement of Solomon b. Aaron Troki in the *Sefer Appiryon*, p. 10, which deals with points of ceremonial law. He there says: "Since we have no priest of the seed of Aaron and are in captivity, our custom is to keep the Fast by abstinence and prayer from evening to evening, to abstain from all work, even mental work, save in prayer and supplication; children, however, and those inflicted with diseases which endanger life are exempted." Their liturgy differs much from that of the orthodox Jews, and was based originally on the Temple Maamadoth.²⁴ It underwent many modifications in the course of time by the additions of Biblical psalms, and metrical compositions dealing mostly with the destruction of the Temple. The half-Hallel only is recited, contrary to the Talmudic decision that the whole should be used on the day (Ros. H. iv. 7).²⁵

The Falashas of Abbysinia, who claim to be Jews, descended from those who came from Judæa with the Queen of Sheba (1 Kgs. x. 1 ff.), fast on the tenth of every month in remembrance of the Day of Atonement, on which, they say, God appeared to Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 10 ff; cf. Jubilees, c. 34). So the day has with them also a commemorative aspect. Dancing on it is part of their ritual (cf. Taanith IV. 87); and their liturgy consists of Biblical passages which have reference to atonement, penitential prayers and hymns. A curious custom is to strew on their roofs and in front of their houses corn for the pur-

²³ See Greenup, *Sukkah, Mishna and Tosefta* (S.P.C.K.), pp. 24 ff.

²⁴ See Taanith IV, 2; Shechter, *Studies in Judaism* (first series), p. 253.

²⁵ A convenient edition of the liturgy is the *Sefer Tefilloth Hakeraim*, Vol. III (Vienna, 1854): analysed by Idelsohn, *op. cit.*

pose of giving the birds a feast. The day is called by them "The Day of Forgiveness."

The Bene-Israel, the "Black Jews" of India, who formerly had no ritual, but of late years have adopted the Sephardic Prayer Book, were accustomed to shut themselves in their houses all day, whence the day was called "the fast of the door-closing," to abstain from all intercourse with their neighbours, to fast and meditate.²⁶

The Jewish Reform Movement, initiated in the early years of last century,²⁷ has, according to one of its ardent adherents, "renounced the abiding authority of the rabbinical codes; it stands for the principle of development and emphasises the prophetic, universal aspect of the faith." In its liturgy, the Union Prayer Book, all references to the restoration of the Temple cultus are eliminated, so no Musaf is introduced, since that service is essentially sacrificial. The piyyutim are generally rejected, though some of those for the Day of Atonement are retained from the orthodox liturgies. On that day shoes are not removed, sagene are not worn, nor is the head covered during worship.

The liturgy of the Liberal Jews²⁸ is modelled on the Union Prayer Book mentioned above, with modifications and additions of a widely charitable character:—"We look forward to the time when all men shall be united in the worship of God, and shall together pursue righteousness and truth in His name" (op. cit below, p. 229): "We pray for those not of the house of Israel . . . they are our brethren in the love of God and in the pursuit of truth" (p. 235). There is a Musaf service only for the Day of Atonement, containing an adaptation of the Abodah with the heading "The Day of Atonement in History." The Book of Jonah is read in the afternoon service, as in the orthodox liturgies, but is interpreted

²⁶ *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, II. 471 f.

²⁷ For an account of this movement see an interesting series of articles in *Jew. Quart. Review*, Vols. XV-XVII.

²⁸ *Liberal Jewish Prayer Book*, Vol. II (London, 1928).

as an allegory, and there is included amongst the hymns sonnet *cxlvi* of Shakespeare :

Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth,
Fool'd by these rebel powers that thee array,
Why dost thou pine within and suffer dearth,
Painting thy outward walls so costly gay?
Why so large cost, having so short a lease,
Dost thou upon thy fading mansion spend?
etc.

These movements of Reform from the Jewish point of view verify Geiger's statement that "Judaism requires merely the liberating breath in order to become rejuvenated from within." May they prove a step forward to the realisation that "Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth."²⁹

A. W. GREENUP.

²⁹ Romans x 4.

KARMA AND THE GOEL

In an article published in "Reconciliation" (August, 1936) the writer of these lines suggested, that in future development of study on the Atonement "we must have recourse to Comparative Religion and investigate afresh Semitic thought on the *Goel* and Indian thought on *Karma*". The work of specialists in these fields has yielded so far results of the greatest importance in illuminating the lines, on which mankind has so far, whether by its own striving or by Divine assistance, faced the ever recurring problems of sin, suffering, frustration and loss, that have confronted it. Probably more remains to be done by specialists in both departments. Certainly their results need to be better co-ordinated and brought to bear on the interpretation of the Atonement. Nowhere else as in the communities of Israel and of ancient India has such intense spiritual striving been directed in the search for deliverance. Nowhere else was the need for deliverance felt so deeply. At the same time it is difficult to appreciate, how widely the Nearer East and the Farther East differed in their outlook, their quest and their attainment.

We in the Christian Church inherit the soteriological categories and framework, with which Israel was intrusted on behalf of mankind. But for Gentiles they remain too much abstract notions divorced from their context and antecedents. Only the Jewish Christian can be fully at home with them, recognising them in their growth and range and interconnection as vital principles in a Divine order of existence. The Jew who is not a Christian, finds himself increasingly in a position of arrested development. He is unable to take full advan-

tage of his birthright. His birthright shrinks, because it is not fully claimed. His heritage and destiny become for him an enigma. And he becomes an enigma to the rest of mankind. Denied his aid, the Gentile Church, while taking over the promise and fulfilment of Israel's spiritual experience, is only able to appropriate them in an attenuated form.

In the Judaeo-Christian soteriological scheme let us concentrate our attention on one most arresting and pregnant conception, that of the Goel, and try to trace its development from a comparatively humble, not to say homely, origin to the unspeakably lofty eminence, that it later attained. There are other conceptions, with which it entered into combination. But these need not detain us here, except perhaps incidentally. The Goel belongs primarily to the culture of the clan, so different from the culture of the town or the village, and therefore difficult for us to appreciate. Perhaps the closest parallel that we can find to the Semitic clan, is among the Celts of Ireland and Scotland. The feeling of clan solidarity, the sensitiveness regarding the honour of the clan is intense. The clan is intermediate in the social hierarchy between the family and the tribe. The fundamental postulate of ethics, politics and religion is the integrity of community life. The individual counts only as a member of the clan. Genealogies and lays are assiduously preserved and memorised as a common heritage. The integrity of community life is understood physically, economically, morally and spiritually. If it be violated, threatened or diminished, it must be rehabilitated. This imperative requirement imposes obligations upon individuals according to certain customary rules. The individual who is expected to discharge such an obligation is called a Goel, which may be more or less inadequately rendered in English by such terms as 'vindicator', 'redeemer', 'champion'. If any individual refuses to act the part of the Goel in any particular case, some one else must be sought to assume his responsibil-

ity. Blood vengeance, the alienation of property, the threatened extinction of a family for lack of descent are typical instances, when a Goel is required. The name Goel and kindred words are peculiar apparently to Hebrew. But the system of clan culture is common to the ancient Hebrews and other Semites, particularly the Arabs. In essentials it has remained unchanged among the desert Arabs for millenniums. But with the Hebrews, when they settled down to agricultural life, it would necessarily undergo some modification. Joab in slaying Abner acted as the Goel of his brother Asahel. The Goel appears in a more peaceful guise in the Book of Ruth. There is a late word *gaol* with another sense, 'to desecrate'. It may be quite unconnected with the commoner word and merely a variant of *gael*. But when we remember the inveterate Semitic habit of expressing opposite ideas by the same root, it is tempting to suppose that the two words may be ultimately connected and that the original meaning of the root was 'to vindicate or violate a communal sanctity'. This, however, is only a conjecture.

Let us endeavour to realise what is meant when the noun Goel and the corresponding verb were applied to God. This occurred incidentally in early literature, but with appreciable emphasis in the later chapters of the Book of Isaiah. There is not space here to make an exhaustive investigation of references. No doubt we do well to stress the advance in the knowledge of God. Chemosh and Moloch were figure-heads, who did not intervene to raise or correct their worshippers. They merely added an emotional touch or transcendence to the tribal consciousness. Jahweh, unlike them, intervened effectively to correct His people or uplift them. Thus Israel made spiritual progress, while other Semites remained stationary or degenerated. But we may also consider the matter from another point of view. The contrast between the human Goel, with his passions and failures and limitations, and the Divine Goel, could not

escape attention. Jahweh's resources were infinite. He could do the work of a Goel perfectly. He could really set things right all round and maintain community life at an ideal level. So the meaning of the word Goel was immensely expanded. The human Goel operated in a very limited sphere. But as the idea of Jahweh was universalized, so the idea of His work was universalized. The deliverance wrought by the Divine Goel would usher in a new world order. The problem for theology was to determine how far the attributes of the human Goel were expanded or discarded in the Divine Goel. There was necessarily a danger of cruder notions continuing or reasserting themselves at a higher level. They needed to be repressed or sublimated, if religion was not to degenerate again, after the Prophets had raised it so far above the narrow and earthly environment of tribal consciousness. Still there was always a real continuity between the lower and higher conceptions of the Goel and his work.

Such was the legacy taken over by the Christian Church. Soteriological thought became increasingly complicated, partly owing to contradictions implicit in pre-Christian conceptions, as in the abrupt transitions between Weal-and Woe- eschatology, which the Prophets leave without really attempting to harmonise them, partly because theologians lost themselves in abstractions and rarely attained the plastic and concrete mode of thought, which is the peculiar gift of the Hebrew genius. Concepts taken over by Gentile Christians lost their colouring and over-tones. *λυτρωτής* for instance only represents one aspect of the Goel, that of ransomer. But it fails to connote the solidarity of community life, which the Goel secures. It may be doubted also, whether *σωτηρία* is an adequate rendering of the *yeshua*, which the Goel brings. The Greek word implies being safe and sound. The Hebrew word implies having a place in the sun, room to expand without being molested, if we take into account the Arabic use of *yasha*. One may speculate

how far the ideal of *yeshua* can be attained in cramped Palestine by merely political Zionism.

The special character of the Judaeo-Christian soteriological line of thought stands out in relief, when contrasted with the line pursued in the Farther East. It is practical, holistic and concrete throughout, and rises from the particular to the universal. The approach of the Farther East to soteriology is speculative, analytic and abstract. It starts from the universal and never quite reaches the particular. Karma, a single action, is the atom of the moral and spiritual universe. The world and its inhabitants have been generated by a complexity of karma series. In any situation each new karma may contribute to modify the universe for better or for worse or to leave it as it is. Different kinds of karma are evaluated according to a universal standard. The problem is to understand the norm of value and to actualize the appropriate line of karma. If this be done sufficiently in so many millions of worlds, unconditional emancipation will at last be attained, perhaps after the elapse of millions of aeons, and the karma series, good, bad and indifferent alike will be exhausted. That is the vista, which Buddhism and kindred systems, as far as an ordinary European can enter into them, evoke.

Beyond question these great ideas of Karma and the Goel are quite central and fundamental in their respective spheres. In the Judaeo-Christian scheme and in that of the Farther East unconditional emancipation is offered and sought along very different lines. In what sense it is offered, and how far it has been attained in either case, needs to be considered. Whether the two lines can ultimately converge, is also an important question. Upon the answers given to these questions depends very largely the interpretation of the claims of Christianity to be the ultimate and absolute form of religion. Unconditional emancipation is something wider than forgiveness or propitiation or illumination. Atonement is a single, though indispensable moment in that emancipation.

Concentration upon the thought of the Goel ensures a holistic and personal interpretation of soteriology, which is certainly one thing which the world needs to-day. Concentration upon the thought of Karma may elucidate moral and spiritual problems and aid and direct ascetic effort, but it does not inspire faith in our striving or indicate a sufficiently definite and positive goal for our striving.

C. T. HARLEY WALKER.

QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LA CHEKINAH

Jeter un pont entre la pensée religieuse d'Israel et la pensée chrétienne nous semble être une des tâches essentielles de Paul Levertoff. (Nous ne disons pas que ce soit la sa tâche principale, car jeter un pont entre la prière d'Israel et la prière du Christ, entre l'amour hassidique et l'amour chrétien, importe plus encore à ses yeux que l'œuvre intellectuelle.) Depuis l'époque patristique et conciliaire, le christianisme s'est exprimé dans les termes de la pensée grecque. Une christologie hébraïque n'a pas encore été élaborée. Nous attendons du Dr. Levertoff qu'il fraye la route vers ce but.

On ne peut essayer d'édifier une christologie hébraïque sans considérer longuement la question si complexe de la Chékinah. Ce que fut le Logos pour la pensée helléno-chrétienne, la Chékinah pourrait l'être pour la pensée judéo-chrétienne. Cette question de la Chékinah et de ses rapports avec la christologie est, nous le savons, au centre même des préoccupations théologiques du Dr. Levertoff. C'est pourquoi le travail qu'il prépare depuis longtemps sur le thème *Christ and the Shekinah* sera "le livre de sa vie."

Il ne nous appartient pas d'anticiper ici sur ce livre. En consacrant dans le présent recueil quelques lignes à la Chékinah, nous ne prétendons ni reprendre ni même résumer les recherches historiques, philologiques, exégétiques dont la Chékinah a été l'objet de la part de spécialistes éminents.¹

¹ Voir en premier lieu J. Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature*. Londres, 1912. Voir aussi S. Maybaum, *Antibropomorphien . . . mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der* .

Nous ne voulons pas davantage prévoir les conclusions auxquelles aboutira le Dr. Levertoff. Nous supposons comu de nos lecteurs le denombrement qui a été fait de tous les passages de la littérature rabbinique où la Chékinah se trouve mentionnée et les discussions de détail auxquelles ces passages ont donné lieu. Notre désir serait d'indiquer simplement—sans essayer de les résoudre—les principaux problèmes que la notion de Chékinah pose à la pensée chrétienne. Il ne s'agit d'autre chose que d'“introduire” et d'énoncer quelques problèmes avec un peu de clarté.

Des questions d'ordre historique se posaient tout d'abord. Elles concernent le destin du mot et de la notion de Chékinah dans l'évolution de la pensée juive. Le terme de Chékinah, on le sait, ne se rencontre pas dans la Bible, quoiqu'on y trouve le verbe *cheken*, “demeurer, résider,” d'où a été formé le substantif Chékinah, “demeure, présence.” C'est dans la littérature post-biblique, dans les Targumim, le Talmud, la Midrasch, que l'idée de la Présence devient synonyme de Dieu lui-même. Or cette littérature rabbinique est assez tardive pour qu'on puisse poser la question de ses rapports avec les croyances chrétiennes des premiers siècles. Pour ne citer qu'un exemple, le Targum d'Onkelos, qui est un “lieu” classique relativement à la Chékinah, pourrait être contemporain des Synoptiques s'il avait été réellement écrit par Onkelos; mais nous savons qu'il a été formé après Onkelos, dans les milieux babyloniens, à une époque où existait déjà une pensée chrétienne bien constituée. Nous sommes donc amenés à considérer deux hypothèses. Ou la littérature chrétienne primitive, dans ses passages “immanentistes” (notamment dans le quatrième évangile), aurait utilisé une idée déjà en circulation dans les milieux juifs. Ou

Schechina, Breslau, 1870; A. F. Gfrörer *Geschichte des Urchristentums*, Petrograd, 1838; G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, Leipzig, 1898; F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, Leipzig, 1897; voir enfin les articles consacrés à la Chékinah dans Hastings, *Dict. Bible*; Herzog-Hauck, *Prot. Realencycl*; Schaff-Herzog, *The new encycl.*; dans la *Jewish Encycl.*

au contraire, la littérature immanentiste juive, a partir de la fin du 1^{er}-siècle, se serait inspirée de certaines notions chrétiennes. Cette deuxième hypothèse est elle-même susceptible de variantes. Il se pourrait qu'un emprunt fait par la pensée juive au christianisme ait résulté d'une pénétration naturelle et irénique. Il se pourrait aussi que cette influence ait pris la forme d'une réaction polémique. Peut-être les rabbins ont-ils voulu montrer que la croyance d'Israel admettait un Dieu aussi proche des hommes, aussi présent parmi eux que le Dieu chrétien (quoique sans Incarnation). Peut-être, au contraire, par opposition à l'idée chrétienne du médiateur, les rabbins ont-ils voulu insister sur la notion épurée et spirituelle de la présence. Cette dernière possibilité mérite d'être prise en sérieuse considération. Il est remarquable, en effet, que la notion de Chékinah ait fini par absorber complètement certaines autres notions immanentistes telles que celles de la "parole" (*memra*) et de la "gloire" (*yekara, kabod*). Chose étrange: même dans les versions araméennes, nous voyons le mot hébreu Chékinah se substituer aux mots araméens, *memra* et *yekara*. Ne serait-ce point par ce que les versions araméennes étant surtout destinées au peuple, il importait de prémunir celui-ci contre les anthromorphismes? et ce dernier souci ne viserait-il pas, en dernière analyse, les conceptions chrétiennes? Ludwig Blau a écrit: "The polemic attitude which the conception of the Shekinah betrays toward the founder and the ideal of Christianity is unmistakable."²

Cette assertion manque de preuves décisives; il y a là, néanmoins, "quelque chose" qui mérite d'être élucidé et ne manque pas d'une apparente vraisemblance. Mais il faut creuser plus profondément. Même si le développement rabbinique de la notion de Chékinah s'est opéré sous des influences chrétiennes et peut-être en réaction contre le christianisme, il reste à expliquer la genèse de cette notion. Ni les écrivains juifs ni les

² Jewish Encycl., XI. p. 260.

ecrivains chrétiens de la fin du 1^{er} siècle ne l'ont créée de toutes pièces. Elle devait exister déjà dans la tradition israélite. S'est-elle formée à l'époque des Apocryphes? quelle serait dans cette formation le rôle exact du judaïsme alexandrin? Autant de questions à résoudre, et dont on saisit le puissant intérêt.

Un autre groupe de problèmes relatifs à la Chékinah se rattache à l'exégèse du Nouveau Testament. Il existe au moins deux textes neo-testamentaires où l'allusion à la Chékinah paraît probable. C'est Jn. 1, 14: Καὶ ὁ λόγος . . . ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν; et Apoc. 21, 3: Ἴδού ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Il semble bien qu'il y ait ici un jeu de mots voulu entre les termes grecs ἐσκήνωσεν et σκηνή, d'un emploi assez rare, et la racine hébraïque *cheken*. Mais ceci n'est pas certain et devrait faire l'objet d'investigations approfondies. D'autre part, la notion juive de la présence ou de la demeure divines n'auraient-elles pas influé sur certains textes de Paul? Aussi Col. 2, 9: ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, et encore 2 Cor. 6, 16: ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ζῶντος. Même idée dans Jn. 14, 23: καὶ μονήν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα. Tous ces textes évoquent l'habitation de Dieu dans le Temple si fréquemment mentionnée par l'Ancien Testament, et à laquelle les Targumim ont substitué le "repos de la Chékinah". Il faudrait enfin examiner de près les textes néo-testamentaires parlant de la δόξα. L'idée de δόξα absorbe celle de *kabod* ou *yekara*, le mot se réfère (déjà dans les Septante) à la gloire de Dieu manifestée par la Chékinah. Le patriarche Gamaliel et Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah ont nettement parlé de la Chékinah comme du rayonnement d'une lumière visible. Cette notion pourrait donc être sous-entendue dans quelques textes du Nouveau Testament relatifs à la gloire. Par exemple Jn. 1¹⁴; καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς . . . Nous ne pouvons pas affirmer qu'il s'agisse ici de la Chékinah; mais nous pensons que l'attention des exégètes devrait se porter davantage sur ce point.

La notion de Chékinah soulève enfin un ensemble de

questions de proprement théologiques, si l'on essaie de l'appliquer à la christologie. Nous indiquerons ici quatre de ces questions, qui nous semblent être les principales.

Premièrement, la Chékinah est-elle une simple périphrase pour désigner Dieu, une manière de parler? En d'autres termes n'implique-t-elle rien de plus que l'omniprésence divine? Ou, au contraire, s'agit-il d'une présence spéciale, localisée en un point de l'espace, déterminée dans le temps et liée à la libre grâce et condescendance de Dieu? C'est en ce dernier sens que parlent beaucoup de rabbins, qui associent la Chékinah au Tabernacle, au Sinaï, au buisson ardent, à la colonne de lumière, etc. Il est évident que nous ne pouvons interpréter le Christ en termes de Chékinah que si celle-ci indique une présence divine très spéciale.

Deuxièmement, la Chékinah étant une présence de Dieu spéciale et objectivée, rendue perceptible à l'homme, cette présence est-elle directe et immédiate, c'est-à-dire est-ce l'essence divine elle-même qui s'objective? Ou cette présence est-elle indirecte et médiata, c'est-à-dire a-t-elle comme support une sorte d'intermédiaire qui ne soit pas d'essence divine, tel que la lumière créée ou les anges? Les deux thèses ont été soutenues. Au XIX^e siècle, Gfrörer voyait dans la Chékinah un intermédiaire dans le genre du logos de Philon, tandis que Maybaum et Hamburger y voyaient la présence de l'essence divine elle-même. Cette question était déjà controversée au moyen-âge. Maimonide, dans le *Guide des égarés* fait de la Chékinah une lumière créée, intermédiaire entre Dieu et le monde. Nahmanide, au contraire, la considère comme l'essence divine directement manifestée. Si l'on professe que Jésus-Christ est la réalisation suprême de la Chékinah, si l'on cherche à atteindre l'Incarnation par cette voie hébraïque (peut-être plus simple et plus accessible que la voie grecque), la christologie changera de sens selon qu'on adoptera l'interprétation de Maimonide ou celle de Nahmanide. Se rallier aux vues de Maimonide, c'est renoncer à la consubstantialité de Jésus et du Père.

Soutenir la these de Nahmanide, c'est sauvegarder la doctrine de l'homooousios.

Troisièmement, en supposant que la Chékinah soit l'essence divine ell-même, constitue-t-elle une entité distincte de Jahveh? s'identifie elle à lui de telle sorte qu'une relation de "je" à "toi" soit impossible entre eux? on faut-il entendre dans le sens littéral, dans le sens d'une distinction personnelle compatible avec l'identité essentielle, ces expressions fréquentes: "Dieu envoya sa Chekinah, Dieu fit reposer sa Chékinah?" Cette dernière interprétation seule permettrait de poser une distinction réelle entre la personne du Père et la personne de Jesus, leur identité de nature demeurant affirmée.

Quatrièmement, quel rapport y a-t-il entre la Chékinah et le Saint-Esprit? Les notions de Rouah et de Chékinah ont été parfois identifiées, les deux, Chekinah et Rouah ha Kodesch, constituent des expressions de l'immanence divine. La Chékinah et l'Esprit se manifestaient sous forme visible de lumière. L'Esprit etait une colombe; la Chékinah elle même avait des ailes. La différence entre les deux est difficile à préciser. Cependant une étude attentive des attributs de l'Esprit dans l'Ancien Testament et la litterature rabbinique montre que l'Esprit est bien une realité *sui generis*. On pourrait donc concevoir une christologie fondée sur la Chékinah, dans laquelle les trois notions du Père du Fils, du Saint-Esprit trouveraient leur place.

Nous nous en tiendrons à ces quelques pensées. Nous n'avons fait qu'indiquer des problèmes, formuler peut-être les titres de quelques chapitres d'un traité qui reste à écrire. Mais nous espérons que nous avons fait entrevoir l'importance et la complexité du thème de la Chékinah, spécialement du point de vue de la pensée chrétienne. Espérons que l'oeuvre attendue du Dr. Levertoff ouvrira à la théologie judéo-chrétienne sa route propre.

WHAT ADVANTAGE HATH THE JEW ?

“What advantage then hath the Jew . . . ? Much in every way”—*Romans* iii, 1-2.

The relation of Christianity to nationality is one of the great difficulties and it is one that seems to increase as the time goes on. There is so much to be said on both sides. Our Christian religion is supreme, it is universal, it is Catholic. It admits of no rivalry. It stops no whit short of comprehending and comprising the whole of the human race.

Very well then; on that account it must impose itself, and must bring all the various bodies, nations, tribes, and so on, of our human race into line, into order, under its direction; it must be supreme. And therefore all that inclines us to say that nationality must give way. That is especially the case when you think not of the strong side but of the weak side of nationality. Nations have their weaknesses as well as their strength. Certain national characteristics are a distinct hinderance to the Gospel, and quite obviously, then, if a nation with strong characteristics which are not very Christian is to be brought into line with Christian life, and into its fulness, it must surrender them—it must give way. It is part of its Christianisation that it should give up any of its own national characteristics that are a hinderance to the Christian spirit, faith and life. All that in nationality must give way; in order that Christianity may be supreme, all that must disappear.

And then there is another side to the matter which we cannot forget, and it is this: Nations have not only their weak side, they have also their strong side. And what about that? Obviously they are not to give up their very

nationality. And if you touch the national spirit in trying to disintegrate it, you may disintegrate all its strong and noble gifts.

Besides, a nation may make the claim which an individual makes. Nationality is something like personality. You do not wish to turn the human race into a number of mere repetitions of one another, you could not do it if you did. We know with regard to personality that it is something which cannot be destroyed like that. It has got something of its own that is sacred, and must on no account be destroyed or weakened on its good side.

It is the same with a nation: it must maintain its own especial gifts, it must have some scope for its own instinct of self-preservation.

But there is a better side, too, than that. It must be thinking all the time, just as a person must be thinking, "now I want to keep these gifts not merely out of self-respect, I want to keep them and guard them jealously in order that I may have them to give, as a contribution to make. I must keep them, not for selfish but for generous ends; keep them, not that I, but that the world may be richer." That is the better and truer side; and on the whole it is the strongest part of the case for nationality.

So there is the problem, as you see; with our Christian and Catholic Faith, with its uncompromising and supreme claims on the one side, and nationality on the other. And it is never very easy to make the right sort of accommodation and agreement between the two: the supreme and universal claims of Christian life and thought, and the strong assertions of nationality.

In many ways the problem is at its acutest when we think of the relation of Christianity to Judaism and to the Jew. I suppose you might say fairly confidently that this problem of the relation of nationality to Christianity is there at its acutest, for various reasons which occur to you at once. Here is the supreme instance of nationality—the tenacious instance we know. Most of the strength and tenacity of nations is bound up with their land, with

their territory, and it tends to weaken as their title to the land is gone. America is at the moment fast gobbling up all sorts of bits of nationality. They come pouring into America with strong characteristics from Europe, and in a couple of generations they are American of the soil. It is the shifting of the land that has done it. Nationality gives way when the soil is left behind.

But that has not been the case with the Hebrew. Wherever he goes he is the same—the same in New York as in London and dotted about all over the world the same. Everywhere his grip upon nationality has been so intense that transplanting makes next to no difference at all. Unlike all the other nations, he stands out distinct in that respect. That then is one difficulty.

We note also what St. Paul says here of the great advantage of the Jew. He has so much, so much of value, so much to contribute. St. Paul will always take that view, and we need more of that view, of that Pauline view of the whole problem. It seems a bold thing if one were to say, without any sort of authority behind one, that there is this difference of the Jew from the rest of the nations, that he has got the advantage. But St. Paul says it quite plainly, and, backed by him, we may say it too. He has the advantage "much every way," and if we begin to say, "in what way?"—because of the contribution he has already made. He has poured into the Christian stream the richest of all contributions, the stored-up treasure of centuries of struggle, and progress, and spiritual experience. All that he has poured into the Christian tradition. That contribution puts him in a unique position—a position of advantage. And that must never be forgotten. There is a supreme instance of nationality making its contribution to the enrichment of the Christian life. I am putting it at its lowest, really.

On the other hand there is the difficulty. Nowhere else is there the same stubbornness, nowhere else the tenacity of national characteristics which, in their working, are hostile to the Christian life and faith. It is

the supreme instance of the stubbornness and unwillingness of a nation to submit its neck to the gentle yoke of Christ.

So, in our prayer, we have these two things before us. We must start always with the view of the advantage of the Jew. On the other hand, there is the stubbornness. We have got somehow to pray that down—the stubbornness of nationality that will not submit, will not surrender the unworthy parts of its national tradition. I say advisedly the unworthy parts, for it is all a matter of selection. When once we have recognised the enormous advantage side by side with the disadvantage, we look to see exactly what the profit and loss account is, so to speak, as the nation submits itself to Christ, what it will keep, and what it will surrender.

It is so in every mission field in the world. How much of what is peculiar to the Japanese or Chinese, or whoever it may be, is to be kept in their new Christian life, and how much is to be surrendered. That is the missionary problem everywhere. And it is very acute here in relation to Hebrew Christianity—how much is to be kept, and how much is to be surrendered.

But clearly, at any rate, one must say this, must one not? if an Englishman has not ceased to be an Englishman by becoming a Christian, or a Frenchman a Frenchman, there is no reason why a Jew should cease to be a Jew by becoming a Christian.

Great national characteristics are to be kept; all, that is, that can really be contributed and so add to the richness of our Christian inheritance. All is to be kept, not a bit to be surrendered. Only those things are to be surrendered that are inconsistent with and hostile to the Gospel. And when you think of that particular point from the point of view of Judaism, it is not merely a past contribution that they have made, all that tremendous wealth they poured in at the early stages of the Kingdom of God on earth; but is it not true to say that there is still further a great deal more, a direct contribution that the

Hebrew race is to make to our Christian faith? They have not stood still since the coming of the Lord. Although in many ways their history has been antagonistic to our Christian progress, remember, they have not stood still. They have been accumulating much in the way of riches of devotion, in the knowledge of God; much in prayer, perhaps still more in praise. Much in all that intimate communion with God. These things, ever since our Lord's time, the Hebrew race has been accumulating, gathering together, so to speak—a fresh treasure to be poured into the treasure-house of Christ's Kingdom, when they come in.

And so there are some lines of our prayer. The hopeful prayer that sees the great advantages, and the patient and pleading prayer that sees the great difficulties and the long inheritance of stubbornness and all the rest.

Can we say that at this moment circumstances are changing? Can we see in the developments of these last few years, which have profoundly modified this problem in all respects, and not least with regard to the relation of the Hebrew and Christian faith, that we are at the beginning of a new chapter, that things are moving in a new way? Certainly, externally there is a good deal to be said for that view, and it is a justifiable view. If so, we can pray all the more keenly, because we shall pray with all the more hope. And if that is not the case, if we are still very much where we were, and the things that look like changes are just surface things, then too, we will pray all the more earnestly; not because of the hopefulness, but because of the intensity of the need.

W. H. FRERE, C.R.

THE CALLING OF THE JEWS

The tragedy of the Jews is a tragedy for tears of blood. Of all the peoples of the world they are perhaps at once the greatest and the most unhappy, and their greatness is in close connexion with their misery. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." To be known of God is to be chosen as the instrument of His purpose. But the higher the purpose, the greater the suffering if the purpose is not fulfilled. Just because the purpose of God is in every detail the expression of His wisdom and love and righteousness, it is not possible for Him to abandon it. God, it is true, is no doctrinaire like a great chess-player, who uses the moves of his opponent, working them into his own scheme; He can, and will, realize His purpose at last, whatever we may do to thwart it. But the great lines of His action are unalterable; His gifts and calling "are without repentance"; and just because they remain, there must always be misery till the gifts are rightly used and the calling accepted. That is so with the Christian Church to-day:

Crowns and thrones may perish,
Kingdoms rise and wane;
But the Church of Jesus,
Constant shall remain.

Constant—yes, but how? Constant in happiness or constant in misery? That depends upon the Church's response to its calling. It may be a happier thing to rise and wane, and in due time perish, than to remain as savourless salt, and be trodden under foot of men. Has it not been so with the great people of Israel? It was Israel

that God chose first to be His Church; and He has, we believe, a great purpose for it still. That is why it does not pass away. It bows its persecutors one by one off the stage of history, but itself lives on. But the miracle of its survival is a tragic miracle. One day, St. Paul seems to say, it will refuse its calling no longer, and "all Israel will be saved." God hasten the time!

I.

Where has the sin of the Jews mainly lain? In that nationalism, which in others is the chief source of the suffering of the Jews to-day. "Putting them in remembrance by the very things wherein they sin, dost thou admonish them, that escaping from their wickedness they may believe on thee, O Lord." Nationalism stains the Old Testament itself, and we should hardly expect it to be otherwise. Devotion to the tribe, and to tribal rather than to individual interests, is the highest of which primitive man is capable. For the Christian, as Edith Cavell said, "patriotism is not enough"; but we should never decry it except in its contrast with that which is higher still. The German boy to whom it seems beautiful to die with a French bullet in his heart is higher, not lower, than the English boy who is not ready to die for anybody or anything. "Deutschland über alles" is a noble watchword; it does not mean Germany, the tyrant of the world, but "Germany first, and the individual German in comparison nowhere." With the warriors of Israel in early days, as the song of Deborah shows, religion and patriotism were one. Yahweh was "a man of war," the God of the armies of Israel; and in the very fury of their onslaughts upon other peoples, the warriors of Israel felt themselves to be fighting for the glory of Yahweh Himself.

But this outlook presupposed that Yahweh, like Milcom or Chemosh, was a tribal God, who had no more concern with Moab and Ammon than had Chemosh and Milcom with Israel. When it came to be recognised that Yahweh

was no mere tribal God, but "the God of the whole earth," and that the gods of the heathen were "but idols," a great change in outlook should have followed. Slowly but surely Israel should have come to see that God's choice of them to be His people had a higher purpose than their own aggrandisement. If God was the God of all the nations of the earth, and there was no other than He, it must be for the benefit of all that Israel had been chosen. There was no hurry in the divine teaching. Other lessons had to be learned first—the holiness and righteousness of Yahweh Himself, the unqualified loyalty to be given to Him, the dependence of His favour and protection upon the fulfilment of His moral demands; it was with these lessons that the great prophets were at first concerned. We do not at first find any clear indication that Israel is intended to be the means of blessing to all the nations of the world.

Though the promise to Abraham seems to provide an exception, almost certainly it does not. The meaning is, as Moffatt's translation shows, not that Abraham and his seed are to be a blessing to others, but that others will "bless themselves" by desiring to be blessed as Israel itself is blessed. The missionary activity of Israel is to lie in the fact that the world will desire Israel's blessings, and so be attracted to the God from whom these blessings come. No doubt a higher meaning rightly came to be attached to the words at a later stage of the divine teaching, but it was not apparent from the first; and Israel throughout its history has shewn little desire to be a blessing to the world. It is not until Deutero-Isaiah that the true conception of Israel's calling clearly appears, and Trito-Isaiah, in spite of the splendour of its language, shows here retrogression rather than advance. If the other peoples are to be sharers in the coming kingdom of God, it is as servants to Israel rather than as equal members of God's family. We may find the true conception splendidly set forth in the allegory of Jonah, and sporadically in the Old Testament elsewhere; but more

than this we cannot say. "I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee I will curse" are words to be applied with caution. Rightly interpreted, they identify the cause of Israel with the cause of God only so far as Israel makes God's cause its own, only so far as Abraham's influence leads his descendants to share his own "obedience of faith." "I have known him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; to the end that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." But it was only too easy to give them a very different meaning, to forget in the promise the conditions attached to it, and the purpose it was meant to serve, and so to make sonship to Abraham the basis both of a misplaced confidence and of an intolerable national pride.

Now these two interpretations we find in conflict in the Old Testament itself, and it was the tragedy of Israel that the false interpretation on the whole prevailed. The greatest of the prophets laboured nobly to humble Israel's pride. They taught that the choice of God in no way rested either upon the moral excellence of Israel or upon its inherent greatness. They did all within their power to convince Israel of sin, and to insist upon the punishment that must follow; indeed at times they seem to anticipate its utter destruction. But neither its presumptuous confidence nor its nationalistic pride was ever subdued; and it was largely for this reason that the Lord was rejected when He came. It was a nationalistic Christ, a Jewish Hitler, for whom most of the people of God were looking, a Christ who would take them at their own valuation, and raise them to the lordship of the world.

Indeed we find their devotion to the law, in some ways so admirable, itself strongly charged with national pride. They "glory" in it, not only because it is God's, but also because it is their own, because it makes them "a guide to the blind, a light of them that are in darkness, a corrector of the foolish"; they observe it, so far as they

do observe it, because they regard the keeping of it as the means of attaining the national and selfish vindication, or "justification," for which they are looking. That is the charge which St. Paul brings home to them. He never attacks the law on the ground of its moral imperfection; he seems surprisingly unconscious of that. Nor does he altogether repudiate it as a guide to moral action. He attacks it as the means by which Jewish self-righteousness is maintained and fostered, and the need of a divine salvation obscured or denied.

In all this, and in his insistence upon self-surrendering faith as the means of attaining the divine vindication, St. Paul has the highest teaching of the Old Testament behind him and the teaching of the Lord Himself. The Fourth Gospel is here specially important, since it pictures the Lord in conflict with the Jews of Jerusalem, the champions of the law, rather than with the Galileans, the *ame haaretz*, "people of the land," who made little attempt to observe the law as the scribes interpreted it. The Lord, we find, Himself repudiates the law as the means of attaining the eternal life of the kingdom, and repudiates also, as strongly as the prophets and the Baptist, trust in Abraham, while Abraham's obedience of faith is refused.

We see then how great was the place which national pride occupied in the rejection of the Lord. But the tragedy did not end there. It was only too possible for Jews to accept the Gospel as the Apostles at first preached it, to become members of the Church of Christ, and yet still to cling to the exclusive nationalism which had brought Him to the Cross. It was thus that the great controversy of the Apostolic Age arose. No one maintained that Gentiles could not become members of the people of God, and share the blessings and the promises that belonged to them; no one protested against the mission to the Gentiles. But the nationalistic outlook, the abiding glory of Israel as a people, must still be maintained and no one could be a Christian, or at any rate a

perfect Christian, who did not accept circumcision and observe the law. That is why the teaching of St. Stephen and St. Paul was met by a hatred like that aroused by that of the Lord, and why the Jewish counter-mission, which gave so much trouble to St. Paul in Galatia and elsewhere, came to take place. With whom is St. Paul arguing in the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans? With Jews undoubtedly, but not only with Jews who have rejected the Christ sent to them. He is arguing also with Jews who in a sense have accepted their Christ, but without seeing what their acceptance involved; and who now must go either forward or backward, forward with St. Stephen and St. Paul, or backward to that rejection of their Christ to which exclusive nationalism had led.

Now it is here that we reach the second disaster. We know little of it in detail; but it is plain that, in spite of the noble efforts of St. Paul in practice as well as in teaching, and the support of the elder Apostles, the great people of God's choice were soon the people least adequately represented in the Catholic Church. That was a disaster to the Church itself. It meant that the Church as a whole failed to understand the Old Testament, and that the Greek mind and the Roman mind in turn, instead of the Hebrew mind, came to dominate its outlook: from that disaster the Church has never recovered, either in doctrine or in practice. If to-day we are again coming rightly to understand the Old Testament, and thus far better than before the New Testament also, it is to our modern Hebrew scholars and in part to Jewish scholars themselves, that we owe it. God meant, we believe, the Jews to be His missionaries; the first great age of evangelization was the Apostolic age, when the missionaries were almost entirely Jews; no others could have done what they did. If to-day another great age of evangelization is to dawn, we need the Jews again. They are the great link between East and West; they can live anywhere, and are found almost everywhere; they are

still probably the most gifted people of the world. At first, as St. Paul declares, even their rejection of the Christ was used of God for His wider purposes; but now we want them back. "If the casting away of them" was "the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?"

II.

But now about the age-long suffering of the Jews, so deplorably revived to-day. What are we to think of it, and of the justice of God in permitting it? The crucifixion took place a long time ago: cannot God, if reverently we may say so, "forgive and forget"? Are the Jews so much worse than the rest of us? Did they—do they—reject Christ in any other way than that in which we reject Him ourselves? There is a picture by Rembrandt of a Jewish Rabbi in the National Gallery more moving perhaps than any other picture found there; and, when we think of the persecution which the Jews have had to endure down the centuries, we are with Robert Browning in *Holy Cross Day* in almost every word that he writes.

Thou! if thou wast he, who at mid-watch came,
By the starlight, naming a dubious name!
And if, too heavy with sleep—too rash
With fear—O thou, if that martyr-gash
Fell on thee coming to take thine own,
And we gave the Cross, where we owed the Throne—

Thou art the Judge. We are bruised thus.
But, the Judgment over, join sides with us!
Thine too is the cause! and not more thine
Than ours, is the work of these dogs and swine,
Whose life laughs through, and spits at their creed
Who maintain thee in word, and defy thee in deed!

We withstood Christ then? Be mindful how
At least we withstand Barabbas now!
Was our outrage sore? But the worst we spared
To have called these—Christians, had we dared!
Let defiance to them pay mistrust of thee,
And Rome make amends for Calvary.

But we are now concerned with the providence of God. Why are the Jews apparently a people with whom He "hath indignation for ever"? Are the sins of the fathers nearly two thousand years ago still to be visited upon their children, whatever the character of the children may be? Not so. This law of visitation is bound up with family and national solidarity; and, when the solidarity ceases, the visitation ceases with it. If in primitive times we find no distinction made in a nation between the innocent and the guilty, it is because the distinction as yet so little exists. Family and tribal character is as yet far more real than individual; and, when in Jeremiah and Ezekiel we find at last a rejection of the law of visitation, it is precisely because individual character has become a reality as it had not been before. In this world of confusion, it is true, we still suffer for our fathers' sins; that is an evil which can only be remedied "behind the veil"; but substantially it is true to say that God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children because of the solidarity of the children with the fathers, because they continue to be what their fathers were.

Now what will here be said does not apply to the Jews alone; it applies to every nation, and not least to our own. It is the abiding evil of the national character and conduct which brings its ever repeated punishment. The gifts of God are not bestowed upon any of us for our own personal or national aggrandisement, but for the benefit of all: freely we receive, and freely we ought to give. But what happens, if we do not? It is often said, that, if we misuse God's gifts, He will take them from us; but in fact it is not so. His gifts and calling, as St. Paul says,

are without repentance; and what happens when they are misused is, not that they are taken away, but that they turn to disaster. Let us see the light here thrown upon the history of the Jews.

The charge brought against the Jews by the Romans of the first age of the Church was *humani gentis odium*, hatred of all races other than their own. The charge must no doubt be discounted; difference from others when it is carried far is easily misinterpreted as hatred and contempt of others; and Christians do not themselves escape a similar charge. But in the case of the Jew it was not without truth. On the lower levels of the Old Testament itself there is much hatred of other nations to be found; it sometimes seems as if the coming of the Christ was eagerly anticipated as much for the destruction He was expected to bring to other peoples as for the blessing that He would bring to Israel.

There are two figures in the Old Testament, who, if I am not mistaken, stand for Israel itself. Job is the suffering Israel at its noblest; Jonah is Israel, the prophet to the nations, at its worst. Why will he not go to Nineveh? Why does he go to Tarshish instead? Because he wishes Nineveh to be destroyed. He would be charmed to bear the message of destruction, if he thought that Yahweh seriously meant it. But, as he explains to Yahweh, he knows Him only too well. These messages of destruction are appeals for repentance under a thin disguise. Jonah is neither afraid to go nor too lazy to go; the Jew is neither a coward nor a drone. But if Nineveh is warned, Nineveh may repent and be let off, and that, he thinks, is the last thing to be desired. So Israel of old was swallowed by Babylon, as Jonah by the sea-monster, and after the Exile received its mission to the world again. In some measure it accepted it; the Jews of the Dispersion carried Israel's message and Scriptures far over the ancient world. But the heart of Israel was not changed. It rejected the Lord; it rejected the Catholic Gospel, and (while it could) persecuted the Church.

So with Rabbinical Judaism itself. It had its nobler elements undoubtedly, but it never rose out of its nationalism. It sat like Jonah under its poor temporary shelters, full of self-pity, waiting to see what would become of the great world about it, and too often hoping for the worst. We must not forget the awfulness of its suffering, but we cannot say that it was entirely undeserved.

III.

Finally, what of the situation to-day? The cruelty from which the Jews are suffering to-day is infamous and inexcusable, but we must recognise the greatness of the problem which they create. The vast abilities with which God for His purpose has endowed the Jews are a menace to the peoples among whom they live when they are not used for the purpose for which they were given. We should dismiss the suspicions which sometimes arise of vast subterranean conspiracies organized by the Jews; they are dreams as baseless as those of the Passover sacrifices of Christian children, which the medieval Papacy to its honour investigated, and declared to be without foundation. What cannot be denied is that the Jews by their very efficiency threaten the livelihood of the people among whom they dwell. It has been so in Germany itself. Much of the reputation of the Germans as savants has been due to German Jews, and that reputation is now declining; but the extent to which the Jews had supplanted the Germans in professional life is astonishing, and little known in England. The Germans may base their persecution of the Jews upon the supposed superiority of Germans to all other peoples, and the need for preserving the purity of their blood. But the real basis of their action is largely the efficiency of the Jews, and their own inability successfully to compete with it. The same hostility exists in other countries, and to a lesser degree in England, and needs careful watching; and of

course immeasurably more among the Arabs of Palestine. We may have the most profound sympathy with the Jews in their sufferings, and feel the greatest indignation at the way in which they are treated. But the difficulty is a great one. The Jews do not and cannot as a rule merge themselves in the national life of the peoples among whom they dwell, though the Jews of England offer a partial exception. They remain not only strangers and sojourners, but dangerous rivals; and the more that we welcome in England, the less popular they are likely to be.

What then is to be done? It is hard to see how a happy future can be theirs, while they remain a homeless but nationalistic people, and hard also to see where a home for them can be found. Does not their true future lie in response of God's purpose for them and their merging in the life of the Catholic Church to enrich it and to be enriched by it? Might it not be possible for us English Christians to help them to faith as no others can? We have long ceased to persecute them, or to treat the Jews among us as other than English citizens; they are perhaps happier with us than with any other people of the world. We are showing practical sympathy with them to-day at great cost to ourselves, as St. Paul led his Gentile Churches to do. Yet more. I cannot but think that the way is open for a new approach to them through our modern recognition that the Church of God on which His purpose rests did not begin with the coming of the Lord, nor was the Lord its founder; but that it began when God called Abraham to leave his home, and that the life of the Church has been one continuous life from Abraham's day to our own. The Church is the Israel of God, and the Israel of God is the Church. I had to speak, largely to a Jewish audience, a few weeks ago; and I told them that when I, a Gentile infant, received the Christian form of that rite of baptism used long ago when Gentile proselytes were received into the Jewish fold, I became a member of the commonwealth of Israel; and that my

citizenship in Israel meant far more to me than my British citizenship. To Christians the history of the Jews right up to the coming of the Lord is not the history of an alien people, but the history of our own people; we should regard it just as the Jews do. Not only is there no reason why Christian Jews should cease to keep the Passover and other Old Testament festivals, but we Gentile Christians might keep them also. If we all have a new and better Passover to-day, that affords no reason why the old should be forgotten. "What think ye of Christ?"—that is the question of questions; and it is our different answers to it which keep Jews and Christians still apart. Shall we not consider it together again?

H. L. GOUDGE.

DR. LEVERTOFF'S LITURGY IN LATIN.

MISSALE JUDÆORUM FIDEI CHRISTIANÆ

(ORDO CÆREMONIÆ COMMUNIONIS SANCTISSIMI
REGIS)*Sanctissima Arca a dextera parte Altaris sit et contineat volumina Bibliorum Sacrorum, id est Pentateuchum et Prophetas et, praesertim sin in volumine exstat, Novum Testamentum.**Ad Sanctissimam Communionem celebrandam duo panes Judaici, qui Haloth vocantur, omnibus anni temporibus in patella parati sint, praeter Paschae dies, quo tempore azyma (Matzoth) adhibeantur.**Sacerdos, dum vestimenta coram choro in Sacrestia induit, tranquilla voce dicat: Gaudens gaudebo in Domino, et exultabit anima mea in Deo meo, quia induit me vestimentis salutis, et indumentis iustitiae circumdedit me, quasi sponsum decoratum corona et quasi sponsam ornatam monilibus suis.**Tum hunc hymnum cantat:**Israel, filii tui, congregati sunt ante te, expectantes remissionem, orantes salutare; exaudi deprecationem eorum, accipe petitionem eorum qui facis misericordiam in milibus.**Eodem tempore populus in ecclesia stans hunc
hymnum canere incipit:**Amicus animae meae, Pater misericordiarum,
Duc me ad te in benignitate maiestatis tuae.
Sit amor tuus dulcis mihi.
Lumen mundi, magnificum in pulchritudine,
Anima mea aegrotat amore tui,
Salva eam, Domine, luce tua.*

Effunde super me omnem misericordiam tuam,
 Misericordiam tribue amoris tui filio,
 Videre et laudare virtutem tuam cupio.
 Dilecte, da mihi pacem tuam,
 Gloria tua illuminet orbem,
 Benignitate tua fulgeat vultus meus.

Dum haec canuntur, Sacerdos et Chorus ex Sacrestia in processione ad Altare veniant, cantantes interdum psalmum xxiv:—

Quis ascendet in montem Domini? Aut quis stabit in loco sancto eius?

Innocens manibus et mundo corde, qui non extulit ad vanitatem animum suum, nec iuravit in dolo.

Hic accipiet benedictionem a Domino, et misericordiam a Deo salutari meo.

Haec est generatio quaerentium eum, quaerentium faciem Dei Jacobi.

Attollite portas, principes, vestras, et elevamini portae aeternales, et introibit Rex gloriae.

Quis est iste Rex gloriae? Dominus fortis et potens, Dominus potens in proelio.

Attollite portas, principes, vestras, et elevamini portae aeternales, et introibit Rex gloriae.

Quis est iste Rex gloriae? Dominus virtutum ipse est Rex gloriae.

Simulatque ad Altare pervenerint, ter genua flectant, et postquam Chorus et Populus cantare desierint, Sacerdos ad Populum conversus dicat:
 Benedicite Domino benedicto.

Populus (genibus flexis): Benedictus sit Dominus, benedictus ab aeterno in aeternum.

Sacerdos (ad Mensam Dominicam conversus): Benedictus es Domine, Deus noster, Dominator orbis, formans lucem et creans tenebras, faciens pacem et creans omnia, illuminans in misericordia tua omnem terram et plenitudinem eius, et per singulos dies et semper renovans

opus creationis tuae in bonitate tua. Quam magnificata sunt opera tua, Domine. Omnia in sapientia fecisti; impleta est terra possessione tua.

Benedictus sis, Petra nostra, Rex et Redemptor noster, Creator omnium numinum sanctorum.

Nomen tuum sempiternum
Turba laudat Angelorum,
Sonat hymnus in excelsis
Flumen ut argenteum
Te adorant in sereno
Cum moventur per fulgorem
Suavi luce corus cantans,
Seraphim volubiles,
Quorum unusquisque tempus
Sibi poscit praedicandi,
Nec se iactat, si priorem
Locum tenet aliis.

Sacerdos et Populus: Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus,
Dominus Deus Sabaoth.

Sacerdos: Tibi, benedicte Deus, cantant carmina laudantium; tibi, Rex divine et sempiternae, offerunt laudes suas, quoniam tu solus es elevatus et sanctus, tu facis virtutes et creas nova, tu es Dominus bellorum, tu seminas iustitiam et germinas Salvatorem, creas medicinam. Tu adoraris laudibus. Tu es Deus, qui facis mirabilia. Ostende novum lumen super Sion et dignos nos fac ad fruendum splendore eius. Benedictus es, Domine, Creator luminum.

Sacerdos et Populus: Tu caritate perpetua dilexisti nos, in magna et vehementi indulgentia pepercisti nobis. Elegisti nos in Salvatore ante mundi constitutionem, ut essemus sancti et immaculati in conspectu tui in caritate, in laudem gloriae gratiae tuae, in qua gratificavisti nos in dilecto filio tuo. Illumina oculos nostros et consocia corda nostra, ut amemus et timeamus nomen tuum. Laetemur et exsulemus in salute tua.

Tum Sacerdos ad Populum conversus dicat: Extollite manus vestras in Sancta et benedicite Domino.

Populus: Benedicat te Dominus ex Sion, qui fecit caelum et terram.

Sacerdos: Audi, Israel, Dominus Deus noster Dominus unus est.

Populus: Benedictum nomen eius, cuius regnum gloriosum est in saecula saeculorum.

Sacerdos: Amabis Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex toto animo tuo et ex tota vi tua, et proximum tuum sicut te ipsum.

Populus: Verum et firmum, rectum et fidele, dilectum et pretiosum, bonum et pulchrum verbum tuum nobis est in aeternum.

Sacerdos (ad Mensam Dominicam conversus): Quis similis tui, Domine, magnificus in sanctitate, terribilis atque laudabilis; faciens mirabilia?

Populus: Haec vero vita aeterna est, ut te cognoscant solum Deum verum et Jesum Christum, quem misisti.

Sacerdos: Benedictus es, Domine, Deus noster, et Deus patrum nostrorum, Deus Abraham, Deus Isaac, Deus Jacob, qui in amore misisti Redemptorem filiis filiorum. propter nomen tuum. Benedictus es, Clypeus Abraham.

Tu, Domine fortis es in saecula saeculorum. Tu vivificas mortuos, Tu propugnator es ad salvandum. Benedictus es, Domine, qui vivificas mortuos.

Tu es sanctus, et nomen tuum est sanctum et Sancti laudant Te omnes dies. Benedictus es, Domine Sanctissimus.

Tu das homini perspicientiam et doces hominem intellectum. Benedictus es, Domine, qui das perspicientiam.

Sana nos, Domine, et sanabimur, salvos nos fac, et salverimus, quoniam laus nostra tu es.

(Hic proxima oratio pro praecipua persona inseratur.)

(Si est voluntas tua, Domine Deus noster, Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, mitte cito perfectam sanitatem de caelis, sanitatem animae et corporis ad (NN), inter eos filios populi tui qui aegrotant; propter Dominum Jesum, Salvatorem et Redemptorem). Benedictus es, Domine, qui sanas aegrotos populi tui.

Pater misericordiarum, qui habitas in excelsis, reminiscere Sanctorum tuorum, qui deposuerunt vitas suas pro sanctificatione nominis tui. Memento eorum, Domine, in bonum, propter Dominum Jesum Christum.

Pater misericordiarum, in cuius manu sunt animae viventium et mortuorum, reminiscere animae (NN). Sit anima eius custodita quasi in fasciculo viventium, sit recessus eius gloriosus, repletus iucunditate cum facie tua, per Jesum Redemptorem nostrum.

Pater noster, qui es in caelis, miserere Ecclesiae tuae in tua magna misericordia. Salvas fac oves pascuae tuae, salvos nos fac propter nomen tuum. Consocia omnes eos qui cognominant se ipsos Christianos, in unum corpus in Christo Jesu. Memento nostri, Domine, et omnis populi tui redempti et omnium Episcoporum nostrorum, qui recte tractant verbum veritatis et cleri. Serva nos in unitate Spiritus et in vinculo pacis, quoniam apud te est fons vitae, et in lumine tuo videmus lumen. Nos sumus populus tuus, et Tu es Deus noster. Nos sumus filii tui, et Tu es pater noster. Nos sumus oves tuae, et Tu es Pastor noster. Miserere nostri propter Jesum Salvatorem nostrum, Pastorem et Episcopum animarum nostrarum.

Populus: Domine, miserere nostri.

Sacerdos: In gratia tua miserere Israel, o Petra nostra. Sciant et noverint ei, qui esuriunt bona tua et sitiunt misericordiam tuam et expectant salutare tuum, quia Domino Deo nostro sunt misericordia et remissio. Salvum fac populum tuum et benedic hereditati tuae.

Populus: Propter Te, Redemptor noster, salvum fac.

Sacerdos: Speramus, Domine Deus noster, videre cito gloriam fortitudinis tuae. Dominare totius mundi in gloria tua, exalta temetipsum super totum orbem in maiestate tua, appare in gloria virtutis tuae omnibus inhabitantibus orbem, ut omne opus sciat, quia fecisti id, omnis creatura, quia creavisti eam, et omnes, in quos inspiravisti tuum spiraculum vitae, dicant: "Dominus Deus Israel est Rex et Redemptor."

Populus: Dominus regnat, regnavit et regnabit in saecula saeculorum.

Sacerdos: O Deus, qui das salutem regibus et potestatem principibus, benedic et salvum fac Dominum nostrum Regem Georgium (Reginam, etc.). In eius et nostris diebus Juda salvetur et Redemptor accipiat in Sion.

Populus: Amen.

(Oratio quam Collectam dicunt.)

Tunc Sacerdos volumen Legis introducat et coram populo ostendat et dicat: Date omnes laudem Deo nostro et honorem Legi.

Populus: Benedictus est, qui dedit legem in sanctitate sua populo suo Israel.

Prius quam Lex legatur, is, qui lecturus est, dicat: Benedicite Domino benedicto.

Et Populus respondeat: Benedictus sit Dominus benedictus ab aeterno in aeternum.

Lectio ex Lege desumpta.

Priusquam Propheta legatur, verba proxima dicantur: Benedictus es, Domine Deus noster, Dominator orbis, qui elegisti Prophetas, et cui placuerunt verba eorum, quae praedicaverunt in veritate. Benedictus es, Domine, qui elegisti Moysen, servum tuum et Israel, populum tuum, et Prophetas veritatis et iustitiae.

Lectio ex Prophetis desumpta.

Priusquam Epistula legatur, Sacerdos dicat: Benedictus es, Domine Deus noster, Dominator orbis, Petra

omnium aetatum, iustus omnium generationum, Deus fidelis, qui superedicavisti Ecclesiam tuam super fundamentum Apostolorum et Prophetarum, ipso summo angulari lapide Christo Jesu. Sit voluntas tua, ut doctrina eorum occurramus omnes in unitatem Spiritus. Benedictus es Domine, qui es fidelis in omnibus verbis tuis.

Epistula.

Populus: Omnis gloria sit Tibi, Domine altissime.

Ante Evangelium Sacerdos dicat: Magnificate Dominum mecum.

Populus: Et exaltemus nomen eius in id ipsum.

Sacerdos Evangelium legit.

Populus: Hic est Deus noster, quem exspectamus. Salvabit nos.

Sacerdos et populus taciturna voce Symbolum Fidei dicunt. Tum Sermon sequatur.

Tum Sacerdos panem et vinum decenti et commodo loco exposita ad mensam Dominicam afferat et populum hunc in modum exhortetur:

Sileat omnis caro a facie Domini. Ex Sion species decoris eius, Deus manifeste veniet, ut foedus ineat sacrificio. Accedite cum timore et tremore et laetitia, cum simplici corde et firmo spiritu. Salvator noster venit, ut offerret semetipsum pro nobis. Carnem suam dedit pro salute nostra. Panis eius est panis caelestis. Sanguis eius plenus est vitae. Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.

Sacerdos: Salutare tuum exspecto, Domine.

Populus: Domine, salutare tuum exspecto.

Sacerdos: Exspecto, Domine, salutare tuum.

Tum Sacerdos Populum ad orationem tacitam admoneat, quo facto dicat:

Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi et caritas Dei et communicatio Sancti Spiritus sit cum omnibus vobis.

Populus: Et cum spiritu tuo.

Sacerdos : Sursum corda.

Populus : Habemus ad Dominum.

Sacerdos : Gratias agamus Domino.

Populus : Benedic, anima mea, Domino, et omnia quae intra me sunt, Nomini Sancto eius.

Benedic, anima mea, Domino, et noli oblivisci omnes retributiones eius. Qui propitiatur omnibus iniquitatibus tuis; qui sanat omnes infirmitates tuas;

Qui redimit de interitu vitam tuam; qui coronat te in misericordia et miserationibus;

Qui replet in bonis desiderium tuum; renovabitur ut aquilae iuventus tua.

Faciens misericordias Dominus, et iudicium omnibus iniuriam patientibus.

Te, Domine Deus noster, decet hymnus et laus et gloria et fortitudo et maiestas et sanctitas et benedictiones et gratiarum actiones, et cantamus Tibi canticum novum pro redemptione nostra et acquisitione animarum nostrarum.

Sacerdos : Vere dignum et iustum est, nos cantare Tibi, benedicere Tibi, laudare Te, gratias agere Tibi, adorare Te in omni loco dominationis tuae. Nam Tu Deus es ineffabilis, incredibilis, invisibilis, inexplicabilis, sempiternus, immutabilis. A sempiterno, Domine, idem es. Laudamus Te, Petra vitae nostrae, Clipeus salutis nostrae, propter vitam nostram et redemptionem nostram et omnia bona erga nos, propter omnia, quae scimus et nescimus, propter beneficia manifesta et abscondita. Porro laudamus Te propter Obsequium, quod vis accipere de manibus nostris, quam quam omnis militia caeli laudem Tibi dat et invocat gloriam et maiestatem tuam, Seraphim et Ophanim et sancta numina. Angelorum exercitus in excelsis et populus tuus deorsum regem Te vocant, dicentes :

Populus : Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth, plena est omnis terra gloriae tuae.

Sacerdos: Sanctus es, et formidolosum nomen tuum, et non est Deus praeter Te. Apparebis a sede tua, Rex noster, et dominaberis nostri, nam exspectamus Te, et oculi nostri videbunt regnum tuum per Salvatorem, Iustitiam tuam. Alleluia.

Populus: Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. Hosanna filio David, Hosanna in excelsis.

Sacerdos: Revelavisti Te ipsum in nube gloriae tuae populo tuo sancto, ut loquereris cum eo. De caelis praedicavisti eis vocem tuam. Orbis universus turbatus est coram Te, et opera creationis trepidaverunt timore. In tonitribus et fulminibus apparuisti eis, et in clangore tubarum revelavisti Te ipsum. Sed cum impletum esset tempus, locutus es nobiscum in sibilo aurae tenui, et misisti nobis Jesum Christum, filium tuum unigenitum, quem amavisti. Parvulus enim natus erat nobis, et Filius datus erat nobis; et vocatur nomen eius Admirabilis, Consiliarius, Deus fortis, Pater futuri saeculi, Princeps pacis; et factus est nobis in salutem. Nam ascendet sicut virgultum coram Te, et sicut radix de terra sitiendi: Non erat species ei, neque decor; et vidimus eum, et non erat aspectus, et desideravimus eum: despectum et novissimum virorum, virum dolorum et scientem infirmitatem; et quasi absconditus vultus eius et despectus, unde nec reputavimus eum.

Vere languores nostros ipse tulit, et dolores nostros ipse portavit: et nos putavimus eum quasi leprosum, et percutsum a Deo, et humiliatum. Ipse autem vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras, attritus est propter scelera nostra; disciplina pacis nostrae super eum, et livore eius sanati sumus.

Omnes nos quasi oves erravimus, unusquisque in viam suam declinavit; et posuit Dominus in eo iniquitatem omnium nostrum.

Et in qua nocte tradidit semet ipsum pro mundi vita, accepit Jesus panem manibus sanctissimus et immaculatis et benedixit et sanctificavit ac fregit deditque discipulis

suis et dixit: Accipite et manducate, hoc est Corpus Meum pro vobis datum; hoc facite in meam memoriam.

Populus: Amen.

Sacerdos: Eodem modo etiam poculum post coenam benedixit et dedit eis, dicens: Bibite ex hoc omnes. Hic est enim Sanguis Meus Novi Testamenti, qui pro vobis et pro multis effunditur in remissionem peccatorum.

Populus: Amen.

Ad Populum conversus Sacerdos dicat: Haec est Communio perfectae Fidei, Gaudium Sanctissimi Regis.

Tum Sacerdos, elevans panem et poculum, dicat: O Domine, emitte nobis Sanctum Spiritum tuum et his Donis, quae proposuisti: Adimple nos bonis tuis, et laetetur anima nostra in salutari tuo. Purifica corda nostra, ut adoremus Te in veritate. Converte nos ad Te, excita nos, et tange nos igne amoris tui, ut amemus Te et festinemus ad Te. Signa super nos lumen vultus tui. Dignos nos fac participes esse mysteriorum tuorum. Custodi nos in sanctitate tua, ut meditemur toto die in iustitia tua; salvos nos fac in gratia tua.

Populus: O Domine, salvos fac.

Sacerdos: Propter Te, Redemptor, salvos fac.

Sacerdos et Populus dicant Orationem Dominicam.

Deinde Sacerdos ad populum conversus dicat: Et haec est annuntiatio, quam audivimus ab Eo, et annuntiamus vobis: Quoniam Deum esse lucem; et tenebras in Eo esse nullas. Si dicimus, nos communionem habere cum Eo, et in tenebris ambulamus, mentimur, et veritatem non facimus; si autem in luce ambulamus, sicut et ipse est in luce, societatem habemus ad invicem, et sanguis Jesu Christi, Filii Eius, purgat nos ab omni peccato. Si dixerimus quoniam peccatum non habemus, ipsi nos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

Si confitemur peccata nostra, fidelis ac iustus est ut remittat nobis peccata nostra, et purget nos ab omni iniquitate.

Populus: Miserere mei, Deus, secundum magnam misericordiam Tuam; et secundum multitudinem miserationum Tuarum dele iniquitatem meam.

Amplius lava me ab iniquitate mea; et a peccato meo munda me.

Quoniam iniquitatem meam cognosco, et peccatum meum contra me est semper. Tibi soli peccavi, et malum coram Te feci; ut iustificeris in sermonibus tuis et vincas cum iudicaris. Ecce enim in iniquitatibus conceptus sum, et in peccatis concepit me mater mea.

Ecce enim veritatem dilexisti; incerta et occulta sapientiae tuae manifestasti mihi.

Asperges me hyssopo, et mundabor: lavabis me, et super nivem deallabor. Auditui meo dabis gaudium et laetitiam; et exultabant ossa humiliata. Averte faciem Tuam a peccatis meis; et omnes iniquitates meas dele. Cor mundum crea in me, Deus; et spiritum rectum innova in visceribus meis.

Ne proicias me a facie Tua; et Spiritum Sanctum Tuum ne auferas a me. Redde mihi laetitiam salutaris Tui; et Spiritu principali confirma me.

Sacerdos: O Domine Deus noster, Deus patrum nostrorum, Tu novisti omnia mysteria Universi et abscondita universarum animantium. Tu inquis omnia cubacula et examinas omnes latebras animae et cordis. Nihil est absconditum a Te. Omnia mysteria Tua sunt. Quis, Deus, similis Tui, qui auferis iniquitatem, et transis peccatum reliquiarum hereditatis Tuae, quoniam volens misericordiam es. Dimitte eis, es propitius eis, reconcilia eos, propter Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum.

Tum Sacerdos ad Populum conversus absolutionem pronunciet et dicat: Apud Dominum misericordia, et copiosa apud eum redemptio, et ipse redimet Israel ex omnibus iniquitatibus eius.

Populus: Amen.

Sacerdos cantet Psalmum xxiii :

Dominus regit me; et nihil mihi deerit. In loco pascuae ibi me collocavit: super aquam refectionis ibi educavit me. Animam meam convertit: deduxit me super semitas iustitiae, propter nomen Suum. Nam, et si ambulavero in medio umbrae mortis, non timebo mala: quoniam Tu mecum es; virga Tua et baculus Tuus ipsa me consolata sunt. Parasti in conspectu meo mensam adversus eos, qui tribulant me: impinguasti in oleo caput meum; et calix meus inebrians quam praeclarus est. Et misericordia Tua subsequetur me in omnibus diebus vitae meae: et ut inhabitem in domo Domini in longitudinem dierum.

Sacerdos Communionem accipit, quo facto elevat Panem et ad Populum conversus dicit: Hic est Panis Christi. Omnes qui esuriunt, veniant et manducent.

Hic Panem frangit et partem dat eis qui communicare cupiunt, et dicit: Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi, etc.

Tum elevat Calicem et dicit: Elevo Calicem salutis et invoco Nomen Domini.

Tum Calicem Populo tradit, haec dicit: Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, etc.

Tum omnes Orationem Dominicam dicant, quo facto Sacerdos ad Populum conversus dicat: Laudate Dominum, omnes gentes: laudate Eum, omnes populi. Quoniam confirmata est super nos misericordia Eius: et veritas Domini manet in aeternum. Laudate Dominum. Lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes hic factus est in caput anguli. A Domino factum est istud: et est mirabile in oculis nostris. Haec est dies quam fecit Dominus: exultemus et laetemur in ea. O Domine, salvum me fac. O Domine, bene prosperare.

Populus: In toto corde meo cantabo virtutes Tuas et praedicabo laudem Tuam. Deus meus es Tu, et confitebor Tibi. Deus meus es Tu, et exaltabo Te. Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini, ad dandam nobis

scientiam salutis, in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum, per viscera misericordiae Dei nostri, in quibus visitavit nos oriens ex alto, illuminare his qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis sedent, ad dirigendos pedes nostros in viam pacis. Alleluia.

Sacerdos ad Populum conversus dicat: Vos qui adheretis Domino Deo vestro, vivitis universi usque in praesentem diem.

Populus: Ego Dilecto meo, et Dilectus meus mihi.

*Sacerdos et Populus, dum processionem faciunt
hoc dicant:*

Sacerdos: Benedictus sit Dominus, vivens, Pater, ex quo omnia sunt et cuius sumus. Et Unus Dominus Jesus Christus, per quem sunt omnes res et nos per Eum.

Populus: Communio nostra cum patre est et cum filio eius Jesu Christo.

Sacerdos: Qui est imago Dei invisibilis et eius gloriae splendor.

Populus: Et ex plenitate Eius nos omnes sumpsimus, et gratiam pro gratia.

Sacerdos: Ubi vero completum est tempus, misit Deus Filium Suum, et Verbum Caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis.

Populus: Et vidimus gloriam Eius, et gloriam quasi unigeniti a Patre, plenum gratiae et veritatis.

Sacerdos: Et Christus passus est pro nobis, relinquens nobis exemplum, ut sequamur vestigia Eius.

Populus: Qui dilexit me, et tradidit semet ipsum pro me.

Sacerdos: Ipse autem vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras, attritus est propter scelera nostra.

Populus: Et resurrexit propter iustificationem nostram.

Sacerdos: Propter quod et Deus exaltavit Illum, et donavit Illi nomen quod est super omne nomen.

Populus: Omnis laus et gloria Ei qui vivis in aeternum.

Sacerdos: Dominus mittet, in fine dierum, Salvatorem nostrum iterum, ut redimat eos qui sustinent finem salutaris Eius.

Populus: Benedictum sit nomen gloriosum Eius in saecula saeculorum.

Tum Sacerdos, ad Altare reversus, populo benedicat his verbis: Benedicat tibi Dominus, etc. (Numeri vi, 22-27).

EINE JUDENCHRISTLICHE LITURGIE

VON LIC. PAUL SCHORLEMMER.

Es ist eine unbestreitbare, wenn auch bedauerliche Tatsache, dass bei der seitherigen Art der Judenmission Juden, die fuer Christus gewonnen wurden, als einzelne in dem Volk und der Kirche aufgenommen wurden, in dem ihre Bekehrung geschah. Diese Losloesung vom Volkstum und von der religioesen Tradition hat-von rein kirchlicher Basis aus schon vor zwoelf Jahren ein Mann als verhaengnisvoll fuer das Volkstum und als ein Unrecht gegenueber dem religioesen Erbe erkannt: Paul P. Levertoff. Von seinem Versuch, den "Juedischen Zweig der katholischen Kirche" darzustellen, moechten wir hier in Bezug auf seinen Gottesdienstaufbau reden. In der Kirche der heiligen Dreieinigkeit zu Shoreditch sammelt sich seit Jahren eine Gemeinde, die unter vielen und grossen Schwierigkeiten versucht, ihren Dienst zu tun. Die Sache schien oft aussichtslos zu sein. Aber seit Herbst 1933 konnte man darangehen, neue judenchristliche Gottesdienste in der St. Georgskirche zu Bloomsbury einzurichten. Und nun scheint auch ausserhalb Englands in Paris und Berlin, etwas in Gang zu sein, was zur Bildung judenchristlicher Gemeinden fuehren kann.

Seither war die Dreieinigkeitskirche von Shoreditch die einzige Staette auf Erden, wo christliche Juden die Liturgie der Kirche unter Anschluss an juedische liturgische Ueberlieferung hielten. Der Lord Bischof von London hat diese Liturgie amtlich genehmigt. Was an Fragen in dieser judenchristlichen Gemeinde auftaucht, wird von Levertoff und seinen Mitarbeitern in einer eigenen Vierteljahrsschrift behandelt. (The Church and the Jews.)

Einen Blick fuer die Eigenart Levertoffs Liturgie und ein Urteil darueber koennen wir wohl am besten gewinnen, wenn wir versuchen, auf Grund des Liturgieformulars anschaulich zu schildern, wie es dort im Gottesdienst zugeht.

1.

An der rechten Seite des Altars steht der in der juedischen Synagoge an der Ostseite angebrachte "Heilige Schrein." Er enthaelt die Buchrollen, und zwar den Pentateuch (die sogenannten fuenf Buecher Moses), die Propheten und, wenn moeglich, eine Rolle des Neuen Testamentes. Fuer die Abendmahlsfeier liegen auf einer flachen Schuessel zwei flache Laibe gesäuerten Brotes, die in der Osterzeit durch ungesäuertes Brot, die bekannten Mazzen, ersetzt werden. Die priesterliche Amtskleidung umfasst ausser dem langen schwarzen Rock, dem Cassock der Anglikanischen Geistlichen, und der Stola in den wechselnden liturgischen Farben den juedischen Gebetsmantel, den Talith, und ein Kaepchen, da ja nach juedischem Brauch waehrend des Gottesdienstes der Kopf bedeckt sein muss. Der Chor versammelt sich bei dem Priester in der Sakristei. Dort kleidet sich der Priester in Gegenwart des Chores an. Das dabei still gesprochene Ankleidegebet besteht aus dem Vers Jesaja 61, 10, den die Geistlichen der Ostkirche sprechen, wenn sie das Sticharion anlegen. Darauf singt der Priester ein kurzes Gebet, in dem er um gnaedige Annahme der Bitten der versammelten Kinder Israels fleht. Waehrenddessen singt die versammelte Gemeinde ein Lied: "Du Freund der Seele, Vater des Erbarmens" . . . Der Inhalt dieses Liedes entspricht dem soeben erwaehten Gebet des Priesters. Seine stellenweise ans Hohelied anklingenden Toene haben die Farbe der Lieder der Chassidim, jener innigen, tief mystischen und dabei stark ethisch gerichteten juedischen Richtung, die fuer Levertoff selbst und fuer viele Juden die Bruecke zum Christenglauben bildete.

Der Priester zieht mit dem Chor feierlich in die Kirche ein, wie es Brauch ist in anglikanischen Kirchen. Chor und Priester singen beim Einzug Psalm 24, 3-10, ein Stueck eines Psalmes, der, wie aus seinem Inhalt und Aufbau hervorgeht, schon in der Tempelliturgie ein Einzugslied war. Der Lobpreis "Ehre sei dem Vater . . ." der nach liturgischer Ordnung der Kirche jeden Psalm abschliesst, ist von Levertoff hier und dort nicht verwandt.

Am Altar angekommen, verneigen sich Priester und Chor dreimal. Der Priester spricht dabei im Wechsel mit dem Chor den Lobpreis, der in der Synagoge das Gebet des Schma, des Bekenntnisses, eroeffnet. Daran schliessen sich, wie in der Synagoge, die zwei dem Schma vorangehenden Lobpreisungen, der Jozer und die Ahaba, beide gegenueber dem in der Synagoge ueblichen Wortlaut verkuerzt und in einzelnen Teilen im Anschluss an neutestamentliche Worte christlich umgebildet. Nach diesen Lobpreisungen wird das Schma gesprochen: "Hoere, Israel, der Herr unser Gott ist der Eine Herr." Waehrend aber in der Synagoge diesem Wort umfangreiche Stellen aus dem Pentateuch folgen, folgt auf das Bekenntnis bei Levertoff bloss der kurze Satz, der das Gebot der Gottesliebe ausspricht: "Du sollst lieben Gott, deinen Herrn, von ganzem Herzen . . ." Ihm laesst Levertoff im Anschluss an Jesu Wort vom groessten Gebot im Gesetz das Gebot der Naechstenliebe folgen. Die Gemeinde antwortet nach dem Satz: "Hoere, Israel . . ." mit dem Lobpreis: "Gepriesen sei der Name seines herrlichen Reiches immer und ewiglich," wie in der Synagoge. Besonders erwaeht sei, dass das im juedischen Jozer erklingende Dreimal Heilig von Levertoff beibehalten; ja, in echt juedischer, seit dem fruehen Mittelalter besonders liebevoll gepflegten Weise, durch einen eingeschobenen Piut (Gesangseinlage in Gebeten) ausgestaltet ist. Levertoff's Liturgie enthaelt darum, da das Dreimal Heilig auch in der Abensmahls-liturgie seine Stelle behaelt, ein zweimaliges Dreimal

Heilig. Sie geht damit auf eine Liturgieform zurueck, die die Kirche einst von der Synagoge uebernomen hatte. In Westen ist allerdings das erste der zwei Dreimal Heilig verschwunden, in der Ostkirche hat es sich in dem Hagios-Gesang (Heiliger, starker Gott) erhalten. Dem Schma folgt nach juedischen Brauch die Lob-Preisung Emeth. Auch hier laesst Levertoff nur dem Stamm dieses heute in der Synagogenliturgie viel umfangreicheren Lobgebetes bestehen. Er laesst ihm ein kleines Stueck des Schilfmeerliedes folgen (Ex. 15), das in der Synagogenliturgie eine grosse Rolle spielt, allerdings an anderer Stelle steht. Die Gemeinde antwortet mit dem Vers aus dem hohenpriesterlichen Gebet Jesu, Joh. 17, 3.

Dem Schma folgt, wie in der Synagoge, das "Hauptgebet," die juedische Tephilla. Hier sind die Verkuerzungen des juedischen Gebetes groesser und einschneidender, als beim Schma. Von den neunzehn Stuecken der nach einer frueheren Gestalt heute noch Schemone-Esre-Gebet (Achtzehn Gebet) genannten Tephilla betet die judenchristliche Gemeinde nur fuef Stuecke, naemlich die Stuecke 1-4, und 8. Dabei streicht auch hier Levertoff alle Erweiterungen und versucht, den urspruenglichen Stamm wiederherzustellen. Im achten Stueck der Tephilla, die eine Bitte um Heilung und Hilfe ausspricht, gibt Levertoff Gelegenheit, Privatgebete fuer Kranke einzuschalten. Das geht auf juedischen Brauch zurueck. Auch das Formular fuer diese Gebete uebernimmt Levertoff aus der juedischen Ueberlieferung, versieht es aber mit dem christlichen Gebetsabschluss, "um des Verdienstes Jesu, unseres Messias und Erloesers willen."

Auf die Tephilla folgen Gebete fuer die Maertyrer und fuer die Entschlafenen, Fuerbitten fuer die Kirche und ihre Bischoefe und Priester, fuer das Volk Israel, eine Bitte um Herbeifuehrung des Reiches Gottes und schliesslich die Fuerbitte fuer Regierung und Staat. Auch hier schliesst sich die judenchristliche Liturgie an juedische

Ueberlieferung an. Das gilt zunaechst schon allgemein, indem im juedischen Gottesdienst reichlich Gelegenheit gegeben ist, an das Hauptgebet andere Bitten anzuschliessen. Die Gebete bei Levertoff klingen wiederholt in Wort und Inhalt an die auf das Hauptgebet folgenden Bittgebete, die sogenannten Tachanunim an, die aber bei den Juden nur an Werktagen gesprochen werden. Ausserdem aber entnimmt er einzelne dieser Gebete unmittelbar der juedischen Liturgie, so das Gebet fuer die Maertyrer, die Bitte ums Reich Gottes, die Fuerbitte fuer die Landesregierung. Nur werden bei den Juden diese Gebete erst in Verbindung mit der Schriftlesung, zum Teil *nach* der Lesung gesprochen. Die im Gebet fuer die Kirche ausgesprochene Bitte um Wiedervereinigung des Volkes Gottes hat allerdings auch bei den Juden ihren Platz innerhalb des Hauptegebetes. Levertoff benutzt an dieser Stelle das juedische Gebet Jaale wejabo, das an Neumondstagen und Halbfeiertagen in die 17. Bitte des Hauptgebetes eingeschoben wird. Im Wortlaut sind juedische Gebete auch sonst hier benutzt, aufs Ganze gesehen aber gegenueber den juedischen Vorlagen vereinfacht.

Auf diese Tachanunim, Bittgebete, folgt das Kollektengebet des Tages, auf Hebraeisch mit einem Wort gleicher Wurzel durch Techinna uebersetzt. Das Kollektengebet passt inhaltlich gut hierher, da es ja auch Bittgebet ist.

Auf das Gebet folgen die Lesungen.

Vier Lesungen werden gehalten, zwei alt— zwei neutestamentliche: 1. aus dem Pentateuch (Toralesung); 2. aus den prophetischen Buechern (Haphtara); 3. die Epistel; 4. das Evangelium. Levertoff vereinigt hier juedische und christliche Ordnung der Lesung. Aber damit greift er auf sehr alten kirchlichen Brauch zurueck. Laengere Zeit hielt in manchen Liturgiegebieten der Kirche der Brauch solcher viermaligen Lesung an, von der die zwei ersten Stuecke aus dem alten Testament genommen werden.

Die juedische Toralesung umschliesst eine Fuelle von heiligem Brauch. Davon hat nun L. nur einen, das Erheben der Torarolle, beibehalten. Die Lobpreisungen vor den Schriftlesungen hat L. bewahrt. Lobpreis nach der Lesung sieht er nur fuer die neutestamentlichen Lesungen vor. In diesen die Lesungen begleitenden Lobpreisungen ist juedisches liturgisches Gut verwandt, das aber im juedischen Gottesdienst teilweise an anderer Stelle steht, bei L. ausserdem meist stark verkuerzt wird. Zwischen Epistel und Evangelium wird ein englisches Lied gesungen. Das Glaubensbekenntnis, das entsprechend dem westlichen Liturgietypus der Kirche auf die Lesungen folgt, wird vom Priester und der Gemeinde still gesprochen. Eine Andeutung in den nachher zu erwaehrenden Eroerterungen ueber die musikalische Ausfuehrung dieser Liturgie scheint mir darauf hinzuweisen, dass der Grund fuer das stille Hersagen des Glaubensbekenntnisses einfach der ist, weil dieses Stueck sich nicht dafuer eignet, in hebraeischen Ton gesetzt zu werden. Darum wuerde eine Unstimmigkeit entstehen, wenn es gesungen wuerde. Aber das Bestreben Levertoffs und siener fuer die musikalischen Gestaltung der Liturgie verantwortlichen Tochter geht dahin, solche Unstimmigkeiten zu beseitigen.

Auf das Glaubensbekenntnis folgt die Predigt.

2.

Wenn christlichem Brauch gemaess auf den Wortteil die Mahlfeier folgt, so entspricht das auch juedischem Brauch. Auf den Sabbath-Gottesdienst folgt zuhause das gemeinsame, liturgisch ausgestaltete Freudenmahl, von dem ein Stueck, der Kiddusch, die Segnung des Sabbathweins, in den allermeisten Gemeinden bereits in der Synagoge stattfindet.

Der die Sakramentsfeier einleitende Offertoriumsvers setzt sich zusammen aus kurzen alt—und neutestamentlichen Worten und klingt aus mit dreimaligem Halle-

lujah. Nach dem Hallelujah erklingt der Ruf: "Herr, ich harre auf dein Heil", der auch in juedischen Liturgien, z.B., beim Nachtgebet verwandt ist. Der Priester stimmt ihn an, die Gemeinde wiederholt ihn, darauf spricht ihn der Priester nochmals. Dabei aendert sich jedesmal die Wortstellung innerhalb des Verses. Das entspricht juedischem Gebrauch. Die Wiederholung und eigenartige Abwandlung solcher Verse wurde auf Einfluss mystischer Richtungen eignefuehrt. Hier erscheint also wieder ein Stueck chassidischer Froemigkeitsuebung. Nach einer Aufforderung des Priesters, fuer die kein bestimmter Wortlaut angegeben ist, wird Stillgebet gehalten. Darauf kommt der apostolische Gruss: "Die Gnade unseres Herrn Jesus Christus . . ." mit der Antwort: "Und mit deinem Geiste", wie in der ostkirchlichen Liturgie an dieser Stelle, und die Einleitungsstuecke der Praefation: "Die Herzen in die Hoehe . . ." Auf die Aufforderung "Lasset uns Dank sagen", die bei Levertoff in der aus den Psalmen genommenen Form "Danket dem Herrn" erscheint, folgen die sechs ersten Verse des 103 Psalmes. Hier werden wir stutzig. Was soll dieser Einschub vor der Praefation und woher stammt er? Er stammt wohl aus chassidischem Brauch. Die Chassidim begleiten ihre Mahlfeiern mit froehlichen Psalmen. Abert auch die Mahlfeier der Juden ueberhaupt, besonders die Ostermahlzeit, hat den eucharistischen Freudenton. So schwingt sich in Levertoffs Liturgie auch nach dem 103 Psalm nochmals die Stimme des freudigen Lobes empor in dem Preisvers: "Dir, Herr, gebuehrt Lied und Lob, Preis und Psalm, Ruhm und Reich . . ." Dieses Gebet stammt aus dem juedischen Jischtabbach-Gebet, das im Morgengottesdienst dem Jozer verangeht und den Schluss der sogenannten Semiroth (Lieder) bildet. Es hat seine Stelle auch in der Liturgie der Ostermahlfeier und ist von da in diese judenchristliche Liturgie uebergegangen.

Wenn die Gemeinde diesen Lobpreis beendet hat, geht der Priester ueber zur Praefation. Levertoff

uebernimmt, mit einer geringen Auslassung, die Praefation der Chrysostomos-Liturgie. Sie eignet sich fuer diese Liturgie besonders gut, besser als die roemischen Praefationen: Denn sie enthaelt Wendungen, die aus juedischen Gebeten vertraut sind, Wendungen aus dem Modim, dem lobpreisenden Stueck der Tephilla, aus der Keduscha der Tephilla im juedischen Musaph-Gebet (Zusatzgebet) und aus dem zum ersten Teil des Morgengebetes gehoerigen, auch beim Ostermahl gebrauchten Gebet Lephikak. Die Gemeinde antwortet mit dem Dreimal Heilig. Waehrend bei dem oben erwaehten Dreimal Heilig der ersten Teils des Gottesdienstes nur der erste Satz ertoent, erschallt hier auch die auf mit einem Lobpreis der Heiligkeit Gottes, ebenso wie die Ostliturgie. Die Fassung dieses Lobpreises bei Levertoff ist alter juedischer Ueberlieferung entnommen. Levertoff versieht den Lobpreis mit einem christlichen Abschluss: "durch Christus, deine Gerechtigkeit. Hallelujah." Die Gemeinde faehrt fort mit dem Benedictus: "Gelobt sei der da kommt." Und dem Hosianna. Diese Stuecke, wie ueberhaupt die Hallelujah-Stuecke bei der Abendmahlsfeier sind aus dem juedischen Hallel uebernommen, aus den Lobpsalmen, die das Ostermahl begleiten. Das Benedictus und das Hosianna haben bekanntlich Aufnahme in alle christlichen Abendmahlsliturgien gefunden. Das sich daran anschliessende ausfuehrliche Gedaechnis der Heilsgeschichte entspricht dem chassidischen Gebrauch, bei den Mahlfeiern die Grosstaten und Worte Gottes mystisch zu deuten. Es entspricht zugleich inhaltlich dem Gebet, das der Priester in der Ostliturgie an dieser Stelle spricht, und zwar kommt es dem betreffenden Gebet in der Basilios-Liturgie nahe. Bei Levertoff leitet dieses Gedaechnis ueber Worte aus Jesaja 53 hin zu den Einsetzungsworten. Das Kapitel Jesaja 53 bildet bei den Chassidim den Gegenstand haeufiger Betrachtung. Wenn Levertoff diese Prophetenrede hier verwendet, so wird damit ausgesprochen, dass im sakramentalen Geschehen beim heiligen Abend-

mahl sich die Erfuellung dessen darstellt, was chassidische Sehnsucht ist: Erloesung, Erloesungsfreude! Das kommt zum Ausdruck in dem auf die Einsetzungsworte folgenden Ruf. Der Priester wendet sich zur Gemeinde und ruft in aramaischer Sprache, in einer Mundart, die der Muttersprache Jesu ganz nahe steht: Da hi seudatha di-mehejma-nutha schelenita chadotha de-malka kaddischa. "Das ist das Mahl des vollkommenen Glaubens, das Freudenmahl des heiligen Koenigs." Dem entspricht der oben angefuehrte Titel der Liturgie. Der Ruf ist nachgebildet dem Ruf, den die chassidischen Juden bei dem gemeinsamen Mahl mit ihrem Fuehrer, dem Zaddik, ebenfalls in aramaischer Sprache, erschallen lassen. Er heisst da: "Das ist das Mahl des Koenigs David, des Gesalbten (Messias)." Was bei den Chassidim Ahnung ist, hier wirds Erfuellung.

Die Elevation, das Erheben der Elemente, ist mit einer Epiklese verbunden. Levertoff benutzt hier den Vorschlag, der im Anschluss an den ostkirchlichen Ritus im revidierten Prayer Book gemacht wurde. Im Wechsel zwischen Gemeinde und Priester wird der Hosianna Ruf nach juedischer Form angestimmt und damit das oben genannte Hallel fortgesetzt, das sich auch bei der juedischen Ostermahlfeier auf verschiedene Abschnitte der Feier verteilt. Der Priester spricht dann in hebraeischer Sprache das Vaterunser.

Worte aus 1. Joh., wie sie in der anglikanischen Liturgie unter anderen Stuecken vor dem Suendenbekenntnis im Morgen—und Abendgebet gebraucht werden, ermahnen zum Suendenbekenntnis. Als Formular fuer dieses dient der 51. Psalm. Er wird von der Gemeinde gesprochen. Der Priester spricht darauf ein Gebet um Vergebung, das der Form der im Prayer Book stehenden Gebete gleichen Inhaltes nahekommt. Als Absolution dient Psalm 130, 7 a 8, ein Stueck, das oefters in juedischen Liturgien verwandt ist.

Der Beichtakt an dieser Stelle stoert den Zusammenhang, wie in der roemischen Messe vor der Kommunion

und in der anglikanischen Liturgie. Er jagt zur Unzeit den eucharistischen Freudenton, der dieser Mahlfeier eigen ist, fuer eine Weile in den Hintergrund. Aber der eucharistische Freudenton kehrt wieder. Der Priester singt den 23. Psalm, der ein bei chassidischen Mahlfeiern beliebtes Lied ist. An den Psalm reiht sich die Kommunion des Priesters. Darnach nimmt er das Brot und zeigt es der Gemeinde mit den in aramaeischer Sprache gesprochenen Worten: "Dies ist das Brot des Christus. Jeder, der hungrig ist, komme und esse." Das ist wiederum ein Wort, das aus juedischer Mahlfeier stammt, diesmal wieder aus dem Ostermahl. Es ist in christliche Form gegossen. Beim juedischen Ostermahl heisst der erste Satz: "Dies ist das Brot des Elends, das unsere Vaeter im Lande Aegypten assen," und das Wort hat eine hier gestrichene Fortsetzung, die Bezug auf das juedische Osterfest nimmt. Die Spendeformel ist die der anglikanischen Liturgie. Vor der Austeilung des Kelches spricht der Priester, indem er den Kelch zeigt, den Psalmvers: "Ich will den Kelch des Heiles nehmen und des Herrn Namen anrufen" (Ps. 116, 13). Nach der Austeilung beten Priester und Gemeinde in englischer Sprache das Vaterunser. Das oben erwachte erste Vaterunser vor der Kommunion entspricht weitverbreitetem evangelischem Brauch, das zweite dem Vaterunser nach der Kommunion in der anglikanischen Liturgie. Dem Hallel gehoeren wiederum die darauf vom Priester gesungenen Stuecke aus dem 117. und 118. Psalm an (Ps. 117 ganz, Ps. 118, 22-25), auf die die Gemeinde mit einem weiteren Stueck des 118. Psalmes antwortet. An dieser Stelle geht der Sang ueber in den Abschluss des neutesamentlichen Benedictus, Luk. 1, 77-79, abgeschlossen mit Hallelujah. Das Hallel dieser Liturgie stellt somit plastisch dar, dass es eine juden-christliche Gemeinde ist, die hier ihr Hallel singt, eine Gemeinde, die im Neuen Bunde steht. Der Priester ruft zum Abschluss der Gemeinde den Vers Deut. 4, 4 zu. Die Gemeinde antwortet mit dem in umgekehrte Reihenfolge gestellten

Vers aus dem Hohenlied: "Ich bin meinem Freund, und er ist mein," einem Wort, das der mystischen Gemeinschaft der Chassidim mit Gott Ausdruck gibt. Der aaronitische Segen endet den Gottesdienst, also ein Stueck juedischer Ueberlieferung, aber entgegen juedischem Brauch nach evangelischem Brauch ans Ende des Gottesdienstes gestellt. Dem Segen folgt noch ein englisches Lied.

Vorgesehen ist noch vor dem Segen eine Procession. Die dabei gesungenen Stuecke sind dem Neuen Testament entnommen. Es finden sich darunter Stuecke aus Joh. 1, dem bekannten letzten Evangelium der roemischen Messe. Entsprechend altjuedischen, von den Chassidim neu belebten Brauch schliesst man mit einem eschatologischen Ausblick, der hier natuerlich sich auf die Wiederkunft Christi bezieht. Dieser Umgang entspricht dem chassidischen Brauch einer froehlichen Tanzprocession nach beendetem Freudenmahl. Aber ueberhaupt war sowohl den Juden wie den Griechen ein gemeinsamer Umgang nach dem Mahl bekannt. Uebrigens unterbleibt diese Procession meist.

Diese judenchristliche Liturgie gehoert in jeder Hinsicht zur Gattung "Liturgie der Kirche." Sie ist volle Sakramentsliturgie und enthaelt alles an Inhalt und Gestalt, was fuer die Liturgie der Kirche wesentlich ist. Sie gehoert zu derselben Gattung, der auch die gallikanische, mozarabische, roemische, griechische, syrische Liturgie angehoert. Sie ist katholisch. Bei allen Bemuehungen um besondere, artgemaesse Liturgien von den puritanischen Gottesdienstordnungen bis heute, besteht die Gefahr, der aller Rationalismus und idealistischer Liberalismus erlegen ist, dass die neue Gottesdienstordnung aus der Gattung herausfaellt. Es wirken sich da eben andere "Ideen" aus. Vor dieser Gefahr hat Levertoff seine Liturgie bewahrt, indem er, entsprechend dem katholischen Charakter der Kirche seiner Umgebung, der anglikanischen Kirche, dem Gottesdienst, den katholischen Liturgieinhalt beliess und auf die Litur-

gische Ueberlieferung der Gesamtkirche zurueckgriff. Es steht damit nicht in Widerstreit, wenn er ebensosehr an juedische liturgische Ueberlieferung anknuepfte. Denn was er von juedischem Gut einfuehrt, ist das, was auch in christlicher Liturgie in seinen Grundzuegen aus juedischer Ueberlieferung stammt. Das ist zunaechst der erste Teil des Gottesdienstes, der "Wortteil," der aus der Synagoge stammt. Aber auch der Sakramentsteil, der, wie wir gesehen haben, an juedische Mahlfeier anknuepft, laesst Stuecke zur Geltung kommen, die ebenfalls von der Kirche uebernommen worden sind und dazu beitragen, den eucharistischen Charakter der Feier deutlich hervortreten zu lassen.

Levertoff gestaltet den Wortteil in engem Anschluss an den Verlauf des juedischen Synagogengottesdienstes: 1. Bekleidung mit dem Gebetsmantel, Lieder, Psalmen 2. Das in Lobpreisungen eingerahmte Schma, 3. die Tephilla, 4. andere Gebete (Bittgebete) und Lesungen. In diesem Teil steht nur ein eigentuemlich christliches Stueck, das Kollektengebet. Man koennte fragen, warum Levertoff nicht auf dieses Stueck verzichtet hat; es stellt in dieser Liturgie einen Fremdkoerper dar. Man koennte fragen, warum er andererseits nirgends den Lobpreis "Ehre sei dem Vater . . ." eingefuehrt hat. Er waere in dieser Liturgie kein Fremdkoerper, denn er liesse sich bei einer Uebersetzung ins Hebraeische leicht in die Form der juedischen Beraka bringen. Man koennte weiter fragen, warum Levertoff nicht noch andere Gebete aus juedischer Liturgie verwandt hat, Gebete, wie das Kaddisch, das jedem Juden sosehr ans Herz gewachsen ist und das mit dem Vaterunser harmonisch zusammenklingt, und das Nischmath-Gebet, in dem das Lob Gottes rauscht, "wie die Stimme grosser Wasser." Man koennte weiter fragen, warum er die Tephilla so stark verkuerzt hat. Man koennte weiter fragen, warum er die reiche Fuelle sinnhafter Handlungen, die in der Synagoge die Lesungen begleiten, nicht beibehalten hat. Man koennte schliesslich fragen, ob es nicht moeglich

gewesen waere, den zweiten Teil in noch engerem Anschluss an juedische Mahlfeier zu gestalten, die doch ein Vorbild christlicher Mahlfeier war.

Ja, man koennte fragen: Geht Levertoff nicht subjektiv vor? Zeigt sich das nicht in der Auswahl der Stuecke und auch in der Gestaltung des Wortlautes? Aber wer die Geschichte der juedischen Liturgie kennt, wird Levertoff keinen Vorwurf machen. Es hat sehr lange gedauert bis der Wortlaut der Gesetze festgesetzt war. Bis ueber ein halbes Jahrhundert nach Christus war er frei. Der heute im Gebetbuch stehende Text ist zudem durch Erweiterungen eines einst einfacheren Textes entstanden. Levertoff geht ueber solche Erweiterungen zureueck zum urspruenglichen Stamm. Dazu spricht sich in der Gestaltung des Wortlautes die neue christliche Glaubenserkenntnis aus. Diese judenchristliche Gemeinde ist durch den Glauben an Christus gesetzestfrei. Sie ist nicht judaistisch in dem Sinne, wie es die Judenchristen des ersten Jahrhunderts waren, gegen die Paulus so hart zu kaempfen hatte. Hier haban wir eine Gemeinde, die ein Zweiglein ist am grossen Baum der katholischen Kirche.

Wollen wir diese Liturgie gerecht beurteilen, duerfen wir auch nicht die Schwierigkeiten verkennen, mit denen es Levertoff zu tun hat. Diese Schwierigkeiten sind riesengross, sie erscheinen oft unueberwindlich. Wie schwierig ist zum Beispiel die musikalische Ausfuehrung der Liturgie. Man lese, was Olga Levertoff, die Organistin der Gemeinde, darueber schreibt.

Man koennte geneigt sein, abschliessend zu urteilen, dass hier ein Versuch vorliegt, eine Synthese zwischen juedischer und christlicher Liturgie herzustellen, der zwar beachtenswert, aber nicht voellig gelungen ist. Aber man bedenke, mit was fuer Leuten es Levertoff zu tun hat, mit Juden, die vom Chassidismus herkommen und die starr gesetzliche, und oft ausserliche und kleinliche Handhabung des Gebetes der juedischen Orthodoxie ablehnen, und andererseits mit solchen, die vom liberalen

Judentum herkommen, kein Hebraeisch koennen und den Ordnungen der Synagoge schon ganz entwoehnt sind. Wenn wir dazu die schon in Ausserlichkeiten vielen und grossen Schwierigkeiten rechnen, denen die Ausfuehrung solcher Gottesdienste begegnet, so wird man urteilen muessen, dass Levertoff getan hat, was unter den gegebenen Verhaeltnissen moeglich war. Und das ist viel. Er weiss selbst, dass das, was ihm als "Traum" vorschwebt, noch nicht Wirklichkeit ist. "Die wirklichen Verhaeltnisse sind so ganz anders, Schoenheit und Herrlichkeit so schwer zu erreichen, das Leben ist so kurz, der Mensch so schwach. Und doch-wer weiss? Am Ende ist es nicht der Mensch, sondern Gott, der den Glauben dahin bringen wird, wo er sich des vollkommenen Genusses erfreuen darf."

THE PROBLEM OF A JEWISH-CHRISTIAN BRANCH OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

"What shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?"—Rom. xi, 15.

If those concerned in the first Council of the Church at Jerusalem, that described in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, could have foreseen the heading to this essay, they might have read it with interest and not a little apprehension. They probably realized that they were dealing with a momentous question—the problem, no less, of a Gentile-Christian branch of the Church—and were doubtless anxious to concede the utmost possible point to the unfortunate outsiders not of the seed of Abraham. They may even have had a sense of the parting-of-the-ways at which the Christian Church had arrived, and of the grave responsibility of their decisions. But if the future were to be thus revolutionary, if a day should come when the admission of *Jews*, not Gentiles, should be the problem? True, the position now is not quite the reverse of theirs. The Christian Church is not in the twentieth century set to consider what concessions she ought to make to companies of Jews anxious to enter, but rather how she may persuade those of Jewish race and belief, largely indifferent to her existence, of the fact that in her they may find the fulfilment of their search for God. But the position *has* changed to this extent, that *then*, those sitting at the Council-table around the chairman's seat were Jews, being forced into a new consideration of their position by the powerful advocacy that the Gentiles could command. *Now*, it is Gentiles who need to do the considering; *they* control the Church's policy,

and it is the hope of those who contribute to this volume that the time may not be far distant when they may face the problem of the Church's relations with the Jews as the urgent matter that it is.

One of the witnesses before that Council would hardly, one thinks, be surprised. In fact, some such situation as the present seems almost to have been part of Paul's plan for the future. God was to harden the heart of Jewry, their loss was to be "the riches of the Gentiles." He even saw the wild-olive branch glorying over those branches of true olive that were broken off, in its possession of "the root of the fatness of the olive tree." (Rom. xi, 8, 12, 17.) But a situation like that could not be the end—"how much more shall these which are the natural branches be grafted into their own olive tree?" The "casting away of them" may indeed have played its part under God's Providence, in the "reconciling" of a large part of the world, but has the time now come when the Church needs most urgently that "life from the dead," that only "the receiving of them" can bring? (Rom. xi. 15.)

What then, from the Church's side, is to hinder this receiving? Leaving apart the Jew's reluctance to change, or to add to, the faith of his fathers, wherein lies the "*problem*" of a Jewish-Christian part of the Church? First, and mostly, in our unhappy divisions.

When we seek to persuade a Jew to find the crown of Judaism in becoming one of us, to what are we inviting him?—hardly to a happy or united family! A Jew presumably understands by "Christian," those aspects of Christianity with which his experience, or his learning have made him familiar. To become a Christian may mean to him identifying himself with the opinions and attitudes of the Italian Curia, and so joining a Church that is compact and unified, simply because it ignores the existence as Christians, of any who deny its compactness and unity. Or it may mean becoming a parishioner of the Vicar of So-and so, by means of baptism and a course

of confirmation classes. He may have seen the Way as presented by the Methodists, or by one of the Autocephalous Churches of the Balkans, or he may know it in parody, with the help of Judge Rutherford, or the Holy Rollers. If indeed there is to be a body of Jewish Christians, how is that body to escape the foul inheritance of division and misunderstanding that centuries of sin and folly have bequeathed to the Church of our days? In the divisions of Christendom there is something different from, and further-reaching than even the amazing diversities within twentieth-century Israel. Dr. Singer, in a recent pamphlet ("The Christian Approach to Jews," Allen & Unwin, 1/-; §2) has pointed out how deep and fundamental in Jewish life are those few and simple things that unite even the most varied Jewish communities,—a common history, a common charity, a common memory of "social pressure of the kind which is summed up in the word persecution"—a common stress on certain ways of conduct. If then we would know the problem we are to face, we must realize that we are inviting Jews to forsake these unifying matters, for membership of a Christian Church in common with those who will demand at once if they be Roman, Anglican, Orthodox, Quaker or Methodist, and according to their answer will treat them with warm comradeship, or at best with distant politeness. A Jew may be attracted by the antiquity of Orthodoxy, by the logic and the calm poise of Rome, by the simplicity and homeliness of evangelical Christianity, by the Friends' witness for peace, but to choose one or other will cut him off from the fulness of fellowship with the rest.

To an Anglican of course, the practical solution seems obvious, and it may be, in spite of its obviousness to us, that it is the best solution after all. We of the Anglican communion form but a small part of the Christian Church, in many areas where most Jews live we are completely unrepresented, we cannot yet entirely rid ourselves of the notion that all the New Testament figures

were "honorary Englishmen," but it may still be that we hold the key. If we have any hope whatever of doing our share to bring about the united Catholic Church of the future, that can only be because smallness and insularity are going to count less than magnificent determination and a charity that will not be baffled. It is easy to sneer at the notion of a "bridge Church," but if the metaphor means that we maintain at least some touch with all the Christian camps on both banks of the river, that we provide a possible meeting-ground for those who without us would have little chance of knowing each other and that we see it as our duty to remain unbroken in spite of every stress and strain, then the ideal becomes noble. Anglicans hope then that for the present distress, the Jewish-Christian branch of the Church will remain in communion with them. They offer all the riches of the Catholic conception of the Christian faith; the Eucharist that "Meal of the Holy King" wherein the modern worshipper comes close to the Upper Room in Jerusalem,—Holy Order, that may preserve (who knows?) touch with a Jewish priesthood even older than our era¹ and a general sense of the excellence of looking to the rock whence we were hewn. Yet it is a Catholicism at least so much alive to new movements of the spirit, as to welcome as an addition to its heritage a Hebrew-Christian Liturgy, and which knows of other ways to unity in Christ, than mere absorption.

Even were the problem of Christian disunity in some way solved, what then? Even the Christian Church cannot in the long run display a greater understanding and power of fellowship than those of the individual Christians who compose it. And while discussion of the Jewish-Christian problem in an airy and theoretic way can go on pleasantly for long enough, it has an unpleasant habit every now and then of appearing in real life. I was addressing a meeting of young men only a few weeks ago

¹ cf. Dr. Levertoff's essay, "*Synagogue Worship in the First Century*," in *Liturgy and Worship*, S.P.C.K., p. 63 and Acts vi. 7.

on the subject of a Christian's attitude to the Jews, and I thought I had given a fairly clear resumé of the kind of thing that the Jewish Christian group is trying to say. The first remark at question-time was illuminating, "Yes, that is all right, but where does the ordinary Jew-boy come into this?" That was wise and cogent. It reminded every one of us in the room, that the problem is not, first, that of the relations between the Christian Church and a company of Jewish Christians, but rather that of the relations between a number of professing-Christian men and women, and a number of Jews. And so long as Christians remain less than Christ-like, those relations will continue to be a problem. In my parish there are few Jews, so far as I know not more than a dozen or so families. With these families I have so far not the least acquaintance. Every priest will know the experience of going to a strange door, and beginning to explain his business, to be met in half-a-minute with a pleasant smile, and the interruption, "Oh, I'm sorry, but you see we're Jewish here." Then, without the least ill-feeling, even with a remark about the weather on either side, it is generally expected that the door will begin to shut. *There*, when all the theoretical matters have been settled, as neatly as can be, remains the problem of the Jewish-Christian Church. Here in England Jews and Gentiles live side by side, with a common language, a common national sentiment, a common educational system, with no particular political questions much to the fore between us, one would say, a promising field, but so far there is little more than promise. Were it staunch religion, even bigotry, that divided us, it would at least be understandable, and it would be something to fight. But with Jew and Christian alike developing a shallowness of mind that is disguised, and euphemistically described, as "breadth of mind," those who would readily bring about a change find themselves dealing with an opponent of very protean elusiveness. A few may attend a Hebrew-Christian liturgy, a few may subscribe a shilling to a

Jewish Christian Fellowship, but until the rank and file at least know what is afoot, we are hardly at the stage of even stating the problem to be solved.

To pass from the thought of mutual indifference to that of positive hatred, that is, to a discussion of Anti-semitism, is hardly within the scope of this essay. But so long as an anti-semitic attitude is regarded as even faintly compatible with a Christian profession, a Hebrew section of the Church will remain difficult of attainment. Doubtless some Jews in this and other lands are wholly condemnable people, but so long as any Christian person condemns them *because they are Jews* and not because they are financial jugglers, exploiters of sin, wage-slavers, and what not, so long is that Christian himself more condemnable. Dr. Singer (op. cit. §4) has put within the reach of all, a documented statement of the extent to which many parts of the Church have not only acquiesced in, but encouraged or even introduced anti-semitism, and so far there has been no repudiation of the activities he describes. English Churchmen may be glad to have had no formal part in these things, but we should remember that even in a Christian body with which we rejoice to be in communion, it is now impossible, and not only as the result of external pressure, for a person of mixed Jewish blood to be admitted to Holy Orders.

One thing finally, a Christian must be quite certain that "Nicodemism"² is not enough. We may be glad to know of many of our Lord's own race who are finding a new attractiveness in Him, we may give Him thanks and take courage, but in adherence to Jesus which takes no count of His Body the Church, there can be no final abiding-place. Like its Gentile equivalent of blue-domism, this kind of adherence forgets Jesus' insistence on the family life of those who love Him, and evades the corporate tasks and responsibilities that this mad decade is going to lay upon us all. With the reasons for a Jewish love

² A word coined from the "Nicodemus Jews" or secret believers of Palestine.

of Jesus that does not always envisage fellowship with His Church, a Gentile believer must have every sympathy, whether they be dissatisfaction with the Church's witness or fear of the consequences of joining her. It is hard enough to be a Gentile Christian even in this country; Heaven knows what it costs to be a Jewish Christian either here or elsewhere. Let S. Paul remind us again and again that when he spoke of the "natural branches" of the ecclesiastical olive-tree (Rom. xi. 24), he meant the Jews, and if the ingrafting of "wild olive" has so changed the parent stock that the "natural branches" are no longer of its kind, then for Jew and Gentile alike there is work to do. If God indeed shut up all unto disobedience, he did it that he might have mercy upon all (Rom. xi. 32). Those then who labour and pray for a Christian Church of such a kind that will enable the fellow countrymen of Jesus after the flesh, to find in it their foretaste of an eternal home, may know that they labour and pray to make a way for the mercy of God. They may know too that their labour will not be in vain in the Lord.

W. A. WALKER.

PAUL LEVERTOFF AND THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN PROBLEM

It is appropriate that, in a volume of this character, the emphasis should be laid upon impersonal subjects, the biographical element being reduced to the minimum. For in so far as the compilation is a tribute, it is so rather by virtue of its preoccupation with the interests to which its recipient has devoted his life than by any homage which its authors might wish to pay to his personal attributes or achievements: since all men who strive for the attainment of their ideals for humanity would probably take greatest satisfaction in observing others becoming fired by the same vision and pursuing it with the same enthusiasm.

In my father's case I know this to be correct. What is important, however, is to understand that he is a true son of his People; that, in a narrower sense, the outlook of the rabbis, scholars and mystics who were his ancestors finds an echo in the form and character of his own thought, in which their speculations concerning the future of the Jewish people are more decisively continued, and in which their experiments in Biblical research find completion. They belonged to that section of Jewry whose preoccupations were mystical rather than legalistic—originally Spanish, they migrated to Russia at the time of the Spanish Inquisition, and there intermarried with other Jewish families noted for their piety and learning. It was into this atmosphere of narrow but deep spirituality enshrined in a community cut off almost entirely from outside influences and ruled by the rigid laws of Jewish Orthodox observance, that my father was born. From his earliest days the Scriptures and the Talmud were his

daily bread, Hebrew as familiar to him as Russian, and the thought of God a daily presence in a home genuinely representative of all that was noblest in Jewish life.

The tremendous step from such an environment into the totally different one in which the greater part of his life has been spent, was taken via the schools and colleges which early separated him from his home background and, while ostensibly preparing him for the vocation of a Rabbi, was actually introducing him to that revolutionary liberalism of thought which then went like wine to the heads of the student youth of Russia and, in exposing for them the rottenness of the corrupt political system of the time, served in many cases to destroy their religious aspirations at the same time.

On my father these ideas had a different effect—they led him to Christ. For, by removing the traditional Jewish terror of Christianity and inducing a rational approach to this subject, in the light of the doctrines of universal brotherhood, liberty and equality, they led him to evaluate for himself what had formerly been taboo; and, inspired by the nobility of character of one of his Christian professors, to examine with the trained mind of the Jewish theological logician the claims, and with his spiritually acute apprehension to acknowledge the power, of that mysterious Being with whom the history and purpose of the people of Israel is so inextricably linked.

He was confronted by the age-old challenge of Christ to the Jewish people and to the world—"Who say ye that I am?"—and, with St. Peter, he was able to reply—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!"

From the age of eighteen, when the personality of Jesus thus made, through the Gospel according to St. John, its first powerful and unforgettable impact upon his youthful mind, Paul Levertoff has been following a consistent path—the way of reconciliation between Church and Synagogue, between Jew and Gentile, between the Christianity influenced by Hellenistic concepts and the "Jerusalem Church" from which it

developed—a fellowship rooted and grounded in the O.T. consciousness of Israel's destiny, trained in the age-old expectation of a Messiah to whose fulfilment in Jesus it and its members stood as living witnesses; and impregnated with a profound sense of the historical and of the decisive activity of God upon the plane of human affairs. To follow such a path is not easy—the antagonism alike of the Jewish and of the conventionally Christian worlds may be anticipated: in the former case because the mystical hatred for Christianity has been in part the Jewish people's defence against the disruptive influence of history and circumstance upon her unity as a people; in the latter because a Gentilized Christendom, lapsing into paganism, finds the challenge of the primitive gospel too startling, its demands too rigorous, to be convenient, and because it has for centuries made use of Jewry as a scapegoat for its own grievances and cannot take kindly to the prospect of placing the spiritual heritage and destiny of this frequently despised people in the forefront of its own religious conception.

From the day that Levertoff became a Christian the enmity of the Jewish community was directed against him. The very fact that he was *sincere* in his profession made his apparent apostasy the more heinous a crime. Much had been expected of him in the field of Jewish learning—that one who represented the younger generation of Rabbinic scholarship should desert to the enemy camp was a wound upon the heart of the community which had nurtured and cherished him. Yet, strangely, the very fact that he was sincere, while it magnified the crime, enhanced the prestige of the criminal! Whatever one's attitude to a man who appears to be breaking with his heritage, one cannot despise him personally if he stands to lose by the transaction. Here was no miserable "apostate," surrendering his allegiance in return for worldly honours; no coward, shrinking from acknowledgment of his nationality and trying to change his name. On the contrary, here appeared to the "intelligentsia"

shortly to be swallowed up in the vast cataclysm of world war, a fiery youth who combined the ardent phrases of the political revolutionary with the prophetic accents of the religious reformer; who proclaimed his loyalty to the faith and traditions of his fathers in the same breath that he declared his allegiance to the person of Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah of the Jews and Lord of all life.

Small wonder that his words and personality caught the attention and quickened the interest of a generation whose youth was awaking from the dreams of the Ghetto into the harsh light of a day which called them to battle upon the arena of world politics, and whose aspirations for their people inclined largely in the direction of idealistic but generally non-religious Zionism. Dissatisfied with the conventional forms of Jewish orthodoxy, yet seeking a spiritual basis for their diverse Utopiaisms, the partially emancipated Jewish youth of Central Europe saw in Paul Levertoff one who might be able to give the answer to the questionings of their souls. The old men might murmur, but the young flocked in their thousands to hear him, for by this time he was undertaking numerous lecture tours in Poland, Germany, Palestine and elsewhere.

The Christians with whom he was coming in contact at this period were eager to receive him into their midst. For the most part pious, sincere, but exceedingly narrow-minded, they saw in him a representative of the People of the Book, and welcomed him with affection, as one likely to prove valuable in the struggle to win Israel for Christ.

Alas! their methods, if the truth be told, alienated far more Jews than they won, because their propaganda was crude, their phraseology painfully sanctimonious, and their whole outlook unimaginative. It is a tragic fact that, by concentrating somewhat mechanically upon the statistical aspect of missionary work, by estimating success in terms of the number of baptisms effected, these in many cases worthy and self-sacrificing men left

a loophole both for the entry of the base "rice-Christian" type of spurious convert, who pretends conversion for the sake of gain and so brings ridicule upon the sacraments and contempt upon the Church, and for the activities of unscrupulous people who saw in the missionary world a sphere in which they might profitably operate by spreading sensational and mendacious conversion reports, calculated to obtain the support of gullible people, and by building upon this false foundation an edifice of exaggeration which should deceive certain sections of the public into believing that wonders were being done where in fact nothing was being achieved. In these aims they have been eminently successful, mainly on account of the ignorance of the Christian public with regard to the Jewish problem. All spiritual enterprises are beset by religious opportunism. Perhaps the missionary sphere is specially prone to such difficulties, because its problems are so subtle and the eagerness of the public for tangible results is a consequent temptation to the imaginations of those who in fact know that the job is a long and often a dull one, made up of an infinity of insignificant details and unimportant contacts, and that results can only be measured over a period of years, and then only in terms of *influence*, of the gradual dispersal of prejudice, of the slow awakening of a *desire* to find out more about the person of Christ, rather than in terms of mass conversions or sensational confessions of faith from prominent individuals.

Anyone who knows Jewry from within is well aware that here the problem is doubly difficult, because the Jewish people have already a vital religious heritage, (although they frequently ignore or repudiate it) and because that heritage is the very basis of the new Faith which Christians desire them to adopt—in fact, this Faith is not new but is simply the completion of the very traditions upon which Judaism is founded. "Christianity is Judaism with its hopes fulfilled," was how my father put it and in attempting to implement this slogan he

quickly found himself in conflict with the conventional missionary methods of his co-workers.

From the beginning he was a rebel. He could not conform to the unscholarly obscurantism in regard to the Scriptures, nor to the well-meaning but nauseating pietism of expression favoured by those among whom he found himself. He knew that this was not the way to attract the Jewish masses, thirsting for a message that should give them a clear lead in their struggle for emancipation. He knew that the only way to appeal was through an *intellectual* approach. So he began to write books—a "Life of Christ" in Hebrew, a "Life of St. Paul," a Hebrew translation of St. Augustine's Confessions, and innumerable articles and manifestos in Hebrew, German, Russian, Yiddish and English. A glance at the bibliography at the end of this essay—and that is necessarily incomplete—will show that a major portion of Levertoff's works were produced at fever-heat in the days of his early youth, to satisfy the undoubted demand for constructive, intelligent studies in the problems of Judaism and Christianity and their interrelation.

One theme was gradually assuming prominence in Levertoff's thought—the idea of a distinctive *Jewish Christianity* which should be able to express the inextricable unity of Jewish aspiration and Christian fulfilment in terms at once germane to Jewish thought and rooted in the traditions of the Christian community. Such a unit could serve to break down the Jewish prejudice against Christianity as something alien and disruptive by emphasising the Jewish identity of its members and their pride in the Jewish heritage, while assisting the reunion of Christendom and aiding the Gentile Churches towards a recovery of the essential spirit of the Primitive Church—at once Evangelical and Catholic, revolutionary and mystical.

At that time this concept was not yet fully developed, for his own outlook had not yet been sufficiently enriched by the experience of the corporate and sacramental life

of the Catholic Church—the Christians with whom he was associated were inclined to be spiritual individualists—but he was feeling the need of such enrichment and was seeking for a form of Christian expression which should enshrine the mystical aspirations of that Chassidic Judaism which he considered to be the highest form of Jewish thought, and which he has always found exceedingly valuable as a bridge between the Jewish outlook and the theological concepts of Christianity. In other words, “Christianity expressed in Jewish terms” has always meant, to Levertoff, “Chassidic terms.”

The Great War found him in Leipzig, where he had been appointed to the Chair of Hebrew and Rabbinics, at the *Institutum Judaicum Delitschianum*; this position was an ideal one for him, as it enabled him to convey his ideas to students from all parts of the world, and also gave him time for research and writing. The War deprived him of his post, but kept him in Germany until the Armistice, as a prisoner who, it is interesting to note, was, in spite of many hardships, commissioned by the University to write three books:—

1. The edition and German translation, with commentary, of the *Pesikta Rabbati*, a collection of ancient Synagogue homilies never before translated into any language.

2. German translation of the whole of the Palestinian Talmud, with commentary.

3. “Die religiöse Denkweise der Chassidim”—the first systematic treatise on intellectual Jewish mysticism.

The first and third of these works were produced, though, for lack of funds, only the third was published. The Talmud, though the contract for its production still stands intact, never reached the public, for the same reason, and the advent of a new “race-cultured” system in Germany would of course now render its publication impossible.

All this literary work was done without the aid of a single book of reference or encyclopaedia, and was com-

pleted on an indescribable diet of mussels and chicken-corn!

Early in 1919 we left for England, an emaciated and impoverished trio, with no home and no plans, and, incidentally, no money! My father, after sundry vicissitudes, was appointed sub-Warden of St. Deniol's Library, Hawarden. During the period of his residence there he was ordained by the Archbishop of Wales to the ministry of the Church of England. He realized that such service as he could render to his people and to their Messiah could best be given through the priesthood of that Church which, with all its historical disabilities and natural shortcomings, combines intellectual freedom with ecclesiastical authority, and values equally the Catholic sense of order and the sturdy evangelical emphasis on spiritual democracy and the rights of the laity. Through such a "bridge-Church" much might be achieved for the welfare of the Jewish people, and much for the increase of understanding among Christians.

My father has never had cause to regret this decision. It was to him a great honour and privilege to be admitted into the priesthood: it has been a constant and increasing joy to know the brotherly fellowship and counsel of the fellow-priests, and the Bishops and other leaders of Church life among whom he and his work have found so many true and lasting friends. From the beginning the late Bishop Frere, C.R. was an unfailing source of aid and encouragement. It was in collaboration with him that Levertoff translated the Bishops' Appeal for Reunion (issued from the Lambeth Conference) into Russian. He it was, too, who invited my father to Mirfield for a long course of lectures, first to the Fathers, but later to the students as well. This and many subsequent visits were a great delight, providing as they did a close contact with the finest type of Liberal Catholicism and with one of the deepest and happiest forms of Christian fellowship.

It was in such a Liberal Catholicism that Levertoff found the answer to his needs. It provided the perfect

metier for a genuine Jewish Christianity, and gave the fullest scope for theological research and Biblical Criticism on a sound basis of genuine Catholic Orthodoxy.

At Hawarden he was in constant communication with professors and students from all over the Empire, who came for vacation study or rest. It was a period of great profit for him, as he was able to recover from the bad physical and nervous effects of the War to some extent; yet he could never have been satisfied with so purely academic a post for long. In 1923, as the result of the combined activities of Dr. Frere, the Bishop of London and the then Bishop of Stepney—now Bishop of Southwell—he was invited to become Director of the East London Fund for the Jews, a post which he accepted and which he has held ever since.

This gave him the opportunity of putting into practice the aspirations of his youth, which, reinforced by years of research and experience and clarified by contact with the finest forms of corporate Christian life, were now to be crystallised in his appeal for a "Jewish Christian Church"—a group within the Church Catholic, expressing its Christian belief in Jewish forms of worship and reinterpreting the trends of Christian belief in terms which Jewry could understand, at the same time helping to educate Christian people in their duty towards Jewry, and in the Jewish cultured and religious heritage, so that on the one hand the Church might realize its *corporate missionary responsibility* for Jewry, and on the other that the walls of prejudice might be removed and Jewry be enabled to make a move in the direction of a re-valuation of the claims of Jesus of Nazareth upon His people and upon the world.

This stupendous task pre-supposes that organized missionary activity on the lines adopted for other peoples must be discarded in favour of a more intellectual approach having as its immediate object :—

1. The stimulation of critical interest *within Jewry*, i.e. books and pamphlets, not propagandist but explanatory;

2. The deepening of understanding among Christians, i.e. lectures and articles on the Jewish problem;

3. The building up of a group of worshipping Jewish Christians within the existing communions, prepared to stand forth as accepting their Jewish identity and able to express their Jewishness in forms of worship calculated to appeal to Jews and Christians alike, i.e. a distinctive Jewish Christian liturgy;

4. Propaganda for this "new-old" concept on a wide but dignified scale, including contacts with Jews and Christians.

The East London Fund for the Jews suffered from a geographical limitation and a conventional missionary tradition. At the same time, it was the official medium of the Church of England in the London Diocese and as such commanded respect and was capable of expansion. My father was offered a choice of churches in the East End and chose Holy Trinity, Shoreditch, with its fine hall and useful rooms attached. Lacking a Vicarage, we went to live at Ilford, which enabled my father to establish useful contacts in the Chelmsford diocese as well as in London. In addition its distance from the church has enabled a number of Jews too timorous to enter a Christian church, to venture, Nicodemus-like, to our house for discussion on their religious problems.

One of the first events of the London period of Levertoff's work was his compilation of the Jewish Christian Liturgy—"The Meal of the Holy King." A full description of this service from a liturgical point of view will be found elsewhere in this volume, so that it is only necessary to emphasise here that it is not a freakish experiment, but has been acknowledged by almost all who have studied it, and still more by those who have taken part in it, to be in line with the traditions of Christian worship and to be a moving combination of the Christian

Gospel with the Jewish hope as expressed in the O.T. and in Jewish mystical literature. That it is not a mere theologian's liturgy but a living service is evidenced by the fact that it has been celebrated regularly for years now in several London churches and that all who attend it feel at home, whether they are Jews or Gentiles, English, Russian or Indian. People from all over the world have been present at the "Meal of the Holy King," and have returned to their own countries full of praise for its beauty and simplicity. The music used is based on traditional Jewish chants, but we have been told that it has affinities both with Indian music and with plain song!

The work in London has had many phases, and I do not propose here to enter into details of the difficulties and set-backs attendant upon some of them as these were due in part to the disruptive influence of the cranks and axe-grinders who are the curse of every enterprise, and as such are unworthy of record. But the tasks which confronted my father can be summarised as follows:—

1. Building up a congregation at Holy Trinity.
2. Building up a literary organ of the work capable of reaching a wide public.
3. Divorcing the work, in the mind of the Jewish community, from the conventional missionary associations.
4. Building up a sound group of Jewish Christians.
5. Breaking down Jewish prejudice by providing intelligent non-propagandist instruction calculated to inspire the Jewish public.
6. Educating Christian opinion in the realities of the Jewish problems.
7. Providing a form for free discussion of mutual problems by Jews and Christians.

How have these problems been tackled? I will take them in order.

1. This has been the hardest task, and has never met with much success, because the district where the

church is situated is predominantly populated by Jews, and the church is obscurely placed. In the early days Jewish theological students were in the habit of attending till the Jewish authorities stopped them. Later, other groups formed, and attendance revived, but it has always been a very fluctuating business and we ultimately concluded that Holy Trinity must be considered as a clearing house for experiments rather than as a centre of worship.

2. The "Church and the Jews," from being a tiny leaflet, discriminating news of limited interest to a minute public, has become a quarterly magazine of size and importance, which travels all over the world and can be found on innumerable Church bookstalls up and down the country. Its influence is incalculable, as it is our chief medium of expression and carries articles on current problems and also theological studies to an ever-increasing public.

3. In the early days, we encountered bitter opposition from the Jewish Press. Of late years this has almost entirely disappeared, and Jewish organisations have implored our aid in the struggle against anti-Semitism, while a Jewish publishing house was compelled to call my father to translate several volumes of a Jewish Classic (see bibliography). Patient personal contacts and a firm refusal to indulge in the conventional tactics of proselytism have finally convinced British Jewry of my father's sincerity, though of course there is still a considerable opposition to his aims and a fear of his possible influence upon the younger people.

4. This has not been easy, because Jewish Christians are widely scattered, are distributed among all the Christian communions and have often unfortunately tended to take over uncritically the sectarian prejudices of the Gentile Christians with whom they associate. Not until the advent of Nazi-ism in Germany and the consequent expulsion of many Jewish Christians as well as Jews, did we acquire a *permanent* nucleus of Jewish

Christians. To-day such a group, though small, ^{yet} exists, surrounded by a much larger "floating population," bound to us by ties of common allegiance, though often geographically separate.

5. Lectures at Holy Trinity and elsewhere, personal contacts, and above all the joining with them on common platforms to oppose anti-Semitism have provided witness to the Jews of our standpoint and outlook. Many non-Christian Jews have also attended the Hebrew Liturgy and the luncheons and discussions which usually follow it. The production of *Literature* has been hampered by lack of funds, but through the S.P.C.K., at their special desire, my father brought out a whole series of smaller Hebrew works, under the general title "The Hebrew Library of the Christian Faith," about four or five publications in Hebrew, some original and some translations, among others, "Christian Doctrine of God" and "An Introduction to the New Testament." My father's translation of Werfel's "Paulus unter den Juden" (see bibliography) and its subsequent production were also powerful mediums of *true* "missionary" propaganda, not to speak of such books as "Love and the Messianic Age," "S. Paul in Jewish Thought," and the commentary on S. Matthew for the New Commentary, his translation of Midrash Sifre for the S.P.C.K. series of "Translations of Ancient Documents," the large two volumes of The Zohar on Exodus for the Jewish publishing house Soncino Press, Dalman's "Jesus-Jeshua" and "Sacred Sites and Ways" contributions to such periodicals as "Theology," "The Quest," "Mind," "Laude," etc., not all intended for Jews, yet indirectly impressing the Jews with the fact that a Jewish Christian has a wider spiritual and intellectual outlook than he would have had had he remained within the narrow limits of Judaism. It is amusing to realise that all these and more were typed by himself laboriously with one finger on his Varitypewriter! In addition to the above, my father has always encouraged clergy with Jewish parishes to organise public lectures,

etc., calculated to appeal, without proselytism, to Jews as well as to Christians.

6. An infinity of work has been done under this head, as it is the most important phase of all, since Jewry cannot be adequately approached except by a Christendom penitent for its past hatred, persecution and indifference, thoroughly informed as to Jewish life and problems, and filled with a love and eagerness which render a tactless approach impossible.

By means of "The Church and the Jews," and the pamphlets issued by the E.L.F.J., an attempt has been made to teach Christians about Judaism. Through study circles which have been organised, notably in 1934-5, this work has been implemented. In books and articles it is carried on. Through lectures to clergy and theological students, and through preaching in innumerable churches, by father, aided by those who work with him, has been successful in bringing the Jewish problem into the forefront of intelligent Christian opinion. In lecture courses an attempt was made to educate Church workers more fully in this subject. In personal contact and still more by correspondence, the problems of clergy in regard to Jewish parishioners, and of layfolk in regard to Jewish neighbours, are constantly dealt with. Contact is also established with many Church societies, through which lectures and discussions have been arranged with the object of aiding members to tackle the Jewish problem successfully in whatever phase it presents itself in their area.

Through the Charles Boys Lectures, which my father delivered for a number of years in succession, and also by means of the Boyle Lectureship, which he has twice been deputed by the Bishop of London to undertake—a unique honour—he has been able to introduce to the more scholarly-minded Church people the theological implications of that Jewish background without which Christian thought must suffer, and to develop a number of new theories on Old and New Testament problems. In

1928, His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury honoured my father by conferring on him the Lambeth Degree of Doctor of Divinity. "We therefore . . . in recognition of your contributions to Hebraic and Biblical Study have judged it expedient that you, whose Proficiency in the Study of Divinity, Uprightness of Life, Sound Doctrine and Purity of Morals are manifest to us, be dignified with the Degree of Doctor of Divinity."

Above all, the Hebrew Eucharist has provided a focus point for all who care for the future of Israel. There they have been able to meet the problems at close range and to join with Jewish Christians in prayer for their solution. The number of people who have attended this service is very great, though attendance at any one celebration is seldom large. Through our contact with St. George's Church, Bloomsbury, where it has been celebrated on Saturday mornings for the past six years, and with St. Michael's, Golders Green, where it now takes place once a month, we have been able to make the Service known to a large body of people and to forge links of indissoluble friendship with two Christian congregations. Occasional celebrations have also taken place in other London churches.

The Hebrew Guild of Intercession, a subsidiary organisation to the E.L.F.J., has also been the means of drawing Christians together in prayer for Jewry, and the Anniversary of this organisation has become an event of importance in the life of our work, for our supporters come from all over England to attend a special celebration of the "Meal of the Holy King," with an address by some prominent Church leader, and generally come together afterwards for a luncheon and discussion of current problems and achievements.

7. When he first came to London, my father attempted to provide such a form, but the organisation which he founded amid great public interest was quickly menaced by unworthy elements, and he withdrew his support. Subsequently, the leaders of Liberal Judaism

in this country called into being "The Society of Jews and Christians," an organisation on similar lines. Originally on the committee, my father later resigned lest his presence should hamper the work of the Society by arousing the prejudice of the Jewish community. He still gives it his friendly support and it has been able to achieve excellent results in the sphere of friendly discussion between Jews and Christians.

By occasional debates, and by his membership of certain Jewish organisations and neutral bodies, my father has been able to use his influence to promote friendly contact between Jews and Christians on an equal basis. The sum-total of achievement is best expressed in the following formula—"Jewish prejudice has been lessened and Christian interest increased." In addition, there have from time to time been cases of individual Jews who have felt the call of the Messiah as Levertoff himself did, and have been baptized into the fellowship of His Church.

A final, but all-important phase remains to be related. It is the work which has evolved since the rise of Hitler to power in Germany, and which has been redoubled since the annexation of Austria.

The tragedy of the refugees is surely well-known to all. Its repercussions on our work have been tremendous. It was natural that the unfortunate victims of racial hatred should turn to us for aid, since many of them were of Jewish origin and Christian belief. Some of them had been oblivious to their Jewish identity, some desirous of hiding it. Now this became impossible: shaken to the depths of their being, these victims began to discover not only their *Saviour* but their *people* anew, and to turn to us as to their spiritual home.

The Jewish community, which had hitherto considered a baptized Jew as "de-Jewed," could not do so in face of the expulsion of hundreds of such people *for being Jewish*. This has given us an opportunity of explaining the true position.

The tragedy of "Christian-non-Aryans" from Germany or Austria is that they are exiled for their Judaism but are not considered by the Jewish community in this country as being part of that community. However critical we may be of this attitude, it points us to the undeniable fact that members of the Christian family are the responsibility of that family. Acting on this principle—which has not yet penetrated the consciences of all Christian people—the E.L.F.J. has consistently attempted, on very limited resources, to succour the Jewish Christian victims of Nazi-ism. In addition, my father has taken a prominent part in the defence of Jewry in this country against the menace of Fascistic propaganda.

When the Austrian crisis occurred last year, we were first in the field in organising a public meeting in London to appeal to Christians for aid for their "Christian-non-Aryan" brothers.

Public opinion was stirred as a result of the meeting, and reports in the world Press resulted in a spate of pathetic appeals from Jewish Christians in Vienna and elsewhere. It was decided to launch a scheme for the training of some Jewish Christian student refugees, who should be housed in a hostel and given an opportunity to complete their studies in England, afterwards being drafted to posts overseas.

The response of Christians to this appeal was encouraging, the Council of E.L.F.J. made a grant for the furtherance of the scheme, and the hall at Holy Trinity, Shoreditch, was transformed for the purpose of housing the boys, whom we have now been successful in removing from Austria.

With the formation of this hostel one of my father's dreams is coming true—the vision of a Jewish Christian centre of study and worship, somewhat on the lines of the Delitschianum, where Jewish Christians could be trained in understanding of Judaism and its problem, and which would serve as a powerhouse of spiritual en-

richment for the Church. Through this scheme Holy Trinity is coming into its own at last, and our work is finding a more permanent spiritual and practical focus than it has ever had before.

So, in spite of the horror and tragedy which has led to this effort on behalf of a few young lives, cut off abruptly from all that they held dear, I would like to close this survey of my father's life, aims and work on a note of hope and promise befitting one who is still young in his energy and enthusiasm, by envisaging in this Jewish Christian hostel the nucleus of a wider fellowship which the future years shall bring, when Jewish and Gentile Christians, united ever more closely in the bonds of a common fellowship and allegiance, shall by their witness have broken down the last barriers that divide the Jewish people from their Messiah; and when that people shall at last become a part of that New Israel which is the Church of Christ.

For this aim Paul Levertoff has striven for forty years: in this hope his life has been grounded, and in the knowledge of the ultimate certainty of such a consummation he can confidently and gladly proceed upon his way, secure in the knowledge that the fulfilment of the destiny alike of his work and of his people is part of the Divine purpose for humanity, and that, "*beneath are the Everlasting Arms.*"

O. T. L.

A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PAUL LEVERTOFF'S PUBLISHED WORKS

Because of the lack of space we could include in the following list only a selection of Levertoff's works in different languages. But reference must be made to his important contributions to the interesting series of Hebrew books, "The Hebrew Library of the Christian Faith", edited by him; to his contributions to the New Commentary, Liturgy and Worship, The Teachers' Commentary, to Encyclopaedias, and last, but not least, to his many essays, theological and literary, in English and foreign periodicals.—THE EDITOR.

IN HEBREW—

The Religion of Israel. 1902 (5th ed. 1910).

The Son of Man. 1904 (3rd ed. 1910).

The Life of St. Paul. 1905 (3rd ed. 1910).

The Confessions of St. Augustine. 1906

IN GERMAN— (2nd ed. 1928).

Die religiöse Denkweise der Chasidim. 1918.

IN ENGLISH—

Love and the Messianic Age. 1923.

Midrash Sifre on the Book of Numbers. 1923.

St. Paul in Jewish Thought. 1928.

Werfel's "Paul. unter den Juden". 1928.

Dalman's "Jesus-Jeshua". 1929.

———"Orte und Wege Jesu". 1930.

The Zohar on Exodus. Two volumes. 1933.

(Translated from the Aramaic).

This is the first translation of the great cabalistic and most difficult work which, under the form of a Biblical commentary, contains a complete thesaurus of mystic contemplations on the Divine Transcendence and Immanence, on Creation and Redemption, on God and Israel, on Israel and the world, on this world and the world to come, on holiness and sin, on life and death, on the Resurrection and the Messianic Age.